ED 026 032 JC 680 451

By-Berg, Ernest H.; Axtell, Dayton

Programs for Disadvantaged Students in the California Community Colleges.

Peralta Junior Coll. District, Oakland, Calif.

Pub Date 68

Note-97p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.95

Descriptors-*Disadvantaged Youth, Doctoral Theses, Experimental Programs, *Junior Colleges, *Poverty Programs, *Remedial Programs, *Special Programs, Student Characteristics

Identifiers-*California

This in-depth study sought to identify effective programs for disadvantaged students through the use of student and faculty questionnaires. The shortage of evaluative research and criteria of effectiveness preclude making a qualitative judgment on the relative success of the programs or offering a model program. The commonest program is the series or block of remedial courses with many variations. Another approach provides special services such as tutoring, extra counseling, free lunches, free transportation, legal aid, financial help, or part-time employment. A third method involves complete revision of grading, probation, retention, tracking, disqualification, registration, prerequisite, and other policies. (This method frequently improves the climate of the whole school and its near-invisibility is preferable to overt labeling.) Combinations of these three systems are widely used, along with special programs and courses to meet local needs (e.g., African studies). This report lists advantages and disadvantages of the various methods. Colleges are also examining such special aids as learning laboratories and are seeking qualified staff from minority groups. Student responses revealed more similarities than differences among them, a pervasive money problem, lack of study time, the degree of correspondence of expectation with reality, a general approval of the institution, etc. Eight recommendations are offered to the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges and 20 suggestions for the colleges themselves. (HH)

ED0 26032

PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS
IN THE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Ernest H. Berg
and
Dayton Axtell

JC 680 451

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Ernest H. Berg
and
Dayton Axtell

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY E. H. BERG for PERALTA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1968
by
Peralta Junior College District

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the cooperation and assistance of many individuals during the course of the study.

Presidents, deans, instructors, and counselors at all colleges were most generous with their time and extended many courtesies to us during the course of the study.

We greatly appreciate the amount of time taken by administrators, faculty, and staff to comply with the many requests we found necessary to make by correspondence in compiling the information for this report.

We are deeply grateful for the cooperation we received from faculty and students, and we appreciate the time and thought devoted to completing the detailed questionnaires. We are particularly grateful for the many added comments which proved to be so helpful to us.

We also extend thanks to Dr. Leland L. Medsker, Director of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California; Mr. James Trent and Mr. William Raley of the Center Staff; Mr. Scott Baldwin, Data Processing Supervisor of the Peralta Junior College District; Mr. Kenneth Tom, Assistant Director of the Campus Computing Network of the University of California Los Angeles; and Mr. Austin Frank of the Research Division of the University of California Counseling Center, for their help during the planning phases of the study and during the analyses of the data.

Dr. Walter Pentz, until recently the Executive Secretary of the Junior College Advisory Panel of the California State Board of Education, rendered valuable assistance.

Finally, we deeply appreciate the assistance of Mrs. Peggy Salleng, Mrs. Yvonne Trask, and Mrs. Norma Staggs, all of whom typed portions of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES. iv

Section

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY 1

  Background 1
  Purpose 1
  Scope 1

II. RELEVANT LITERATURE 3

III. METHODOLOGY 14

  Definitions 14
  Approach 14
  The Data Obtained 15
    Programs and Attitudes 15
    Information from Students 15
    Attitudes of Faculty Members 19
    Information from Final Question Form 19

IV. FINDINGS. 20
    College Programs 20
    The Final Question Form 39
    Interviews with Administrators 41
    The Student Questionnaire 44
    The Faculty Questionnaire 64

V. CONCLUSIONS 75

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS 77

BIBLIOGRAPHY 79

APPENDIX 80
  A. Preliminary Question Form and Covering Letter 80
  B. Student Questionnaire 82
  C. Faculty Questionnaire and Covering Letter 88
  D. Final Question Form and Covering Letter 92

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Nationwide Median Test Scores for 1st- and 12th-Grade Pupils, Fall 1965 4

Table 1a Income Distribution by College Types - Parent-supported Students 12

Table 2 Responses to the Preliminary Question Form 16

Table 3 The College Visited 19

Table 3a Results from Final Question Form 40

Table 4 Questions Used for Identifying the Disadvantaged 44

Table 5 Personal Information from Students 48

Table 6 Home Backgrounds of Students 49

Table 7 Financial Backgrounds of Students 50

Table 8 Pre-college Academic and Employment Backgrounds of Students 51

Table 9 Reasons Students Attend College 52

Table 10 Reasons Students Like College 53

Table 11 Reasons Students Dislike College 54

Table 12 Ways in Which Students Find College Different from High School 55

Table 13 Ways in Which Students Find College Different from Expectations 56

Table 14 Students' Feelings About How Much Instructors Care for Them 57

Table 15 Students' Reactions to Counseling Service 58

Table 16 Students' Plans for the Near Future 59

Table 17 Students' Career Plans 60

Table 18 Students' Present Needs and Problems 61

Table 19 Sources of Help for Students Needs and Problems 62

Table 20 Sources of Money for Board, Room and Clothing 63

Table 21 Sources of Money for Books, Other College Supplies and Transportation 63

Table 22 Total Responses to Section I of the Faculty Questionnaire 65

Table 23 Responses to the Faculty Questionnaire Classified According to Major Field, Sex, Years of Employment, Age, and College Location 66

Table 23a Classification of Colleges 67

Table 24 Total Responses to Section II of the Faculty Questionnaire 70

Table 25 Responses to the Faculty Questionnaire Classified According to Major Field, Sex, Years of Employment, Age, and College Location 72

SECTION 1 - DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

BACKGROUND

During the past several years a number of studies have demonstrated that equality of educational opportunity has not been achieved in the United States. The growing realization of the gravity of the situation and of the consequences of unequal access to education are causing concern and stimulating compensatory action. For some time such agencies as the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation have encouraged educators to seek solutions to the problem and have generously supported these efforts. The evidence indicates that educators, in general, have reacted slowly and unimaginatively.

At the federal level,concern about the education of disadvantaged students has resulted in the passage of such legislation as the Equal Opportunities Act of 1964, the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. In California the Compensatory Education Act was passed to stimulate schools to establish programs which would provide realistic equal educational opportunity. The California Legislature is presently considering several major bills such as AB 765 (Bear) and SB 125 (Dymally) which would award educational opportunity grants to disadvantaged students who would not qualify for scholarships on the basis of traditional criteria.

During 1965 the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, under the leadership of the Director, Willard Spalding, commissioned a study of programs for disadvantaged students in California's institutions of higher education. The report, "Increasing Opportunities in Higher Education for Disadvantaged Students," was prepared by Kenneth A. Martyn (1966), California State College at Los Angeles. Martyn's report indicated that with the exception of a few hopeful and imaginative programs, junior colleges were doing little more than maintaining an "Open Door" policy. The Martyn report has since been up-dated by John Smart, Specialist in Higher Education for the Coordinating Council of Higher Education, but has not yet been published.

During 1966, Paul Lawrence conducted an informal unpublished study which indicated that only 13 or 14 junior college districts were giving significant attention to the problem of compensatory programs for disadvantaged students.

At the February,1967, meeting of the Junior College Advisory Panel of the California State Board of Education, four junior college districts were asked to report about their compensatory programs. At the same meeting the Panel appointed a sub-committee on increasing opportunity in higher education for disadvantaged students. Subsequently, that committee recommended that a thorough study of programs for disadvantaged students in California's junior colleges be undertaken. This recommendation was approved by the State Board of Education and during the summer of 1967, a contract to conduct the study was awarded to the Peralta Junior College District. Ernest H. Berg, Director of Educational Services of the Peralta Junior College District, was named Director of the Study. Dayton Axtell, a counselor from Merritt College, was named Research Associate.

PURPOSE

The general purposes of the study are identified in the "Scope of Work" section of the contract, which reads as follows:

> Contractor shall furnish personnel, equipment, accommodations and all other things necessary for, and shall conduct a study which will identify and describe those programs which best seem to meet the educational needs of the socio-economically disadvantaged population of college age as well as suggesting feasible alternative means of implementing such programs. Specifically, said study should define the role of the public junior college within such a total program for dealing with the problem of the socio-economically disadvantaged student in California.

SCOPE

A brief overview of the scope of this study may be helpful. The work was begun during the latter part of August, 1967. To best fulfill the purposes of the study it was felt that this research should be a descriptive survey. Because of time limitations and because the efforts of four-year institutions in serving disadvantaged students have been described by others (see for example Martyn, 1966), it was decided to focus this study on the California public junior colleges. These institutions, by their sheer number and by their open door policy, serve far more disadvantaged students than do all other segments of higher education. Furthermore, they are in the best position to extend educational opportunity to the countless numbers of college-age young people who are not now in any type of college.

In order to collect information in adequate depth and detail it was decided to try to make personal visits to all those junior colleges which seem to have programs that might be of assistance to disadvantaged students, whether or not such programs were designed specifically for this group. These colleges were initially identified by a preliminary question form sent out early in September, 1967. During visits to a total of 31 colleges, interviews were held with faculty members, counselors, and administrators. The interviews with faculty members and counselors were designed primarily to get detailed information about specific programs. The purpose of the interviews with administrators was to ascertain general attitudes held by faculty and administrators toward programs to serve disadvantaged students. In almost every case, the president of the college was interviewed. One hundred thirty-six interviews were held, each about one hour in length.

It was considered to be highly important to obtain information about the attitudes of disadvantaged students oward the junior college and toward special compensatory programs. Additionally, information was required about he students' perceptions of their needs, problems, and educational and vocational plans. Time limitations did ot permit interviewing a large enough number of students to avoid sampling errors. Thus, a student question- aire was developed and administered to a sample of students at almost all of the colleges which were visited. he total number of questionnaires completed was 1,068.

Although some instructors and counselors were interviewed in connection with specific programs for dis- dvantaged students, it was felt that a much larger sampling of faculty attitudes about compensatory programs as desirable. Therefore, a faculty questionnaire was developed and sent to all counselors in California junior olleges and to a random sample of approximately 10 percent of the teaching faculty. By the time the response nalyses were made, 1,170 or approximately 70 percent of the questionnaires had been returned.

Near the end of the academic year a Final Question Form was sent to all junior colleges which had not been visited. The purpose of this instrument was to determine whether any of the institutions felt that they should e visited, and also to determine the extent to which programs for disadvantaged students had been planned or stablished since the Preliminary Question Form had been returned.

SECTION II - RELEVANT LITERATURE

Any review of the literature concerned with the education of disadvantaged students or the equality of educational opportunity leads inevitably to the conclusion that if little progress has been made toward achieving such equality it is certainly not because the problem has been inadequately or insufficiently studied. Another justifiable conclusion is that the immediate problem is not further study but rather a program of massive action based upon all of the information already available to educators--and to legislators.

The review of the literature presented here is not intended to be exhaustive but to include only some of the most pertinent recent work such as the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, The Coleman Report, a few studies concerned with the characteristics of disadvantaged students, two studies relative to the need for financial assistance, and some reviews of programs for disadvantaged students.

Although it is not directly concerned with the problem of the equality of educational opportunity, the report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner, et al, 1968) provides the background against which all other studies should be reviewed.

The basic conclusions of the Commission are that

> Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white--separate and unequal. (page 1)

and

> To pursue our present course will involve the continuing polarization of the American community and, ultimately, the destruction of basic democratic values. (page 1)

The solution, the Commission Report stated,

> . . . will require a commitment to national action--compassionate, massive and sustained, backed by the resources of the most powerful and richest nation on this earth. From every American it will require new attitudes, new understanding, and above all, new will. (page 1)

The Commission's study of the American educational system revealed the following:

1. . . . for many minorities and particularly the children of the racial ghetto, the schools have failed to provide the educational experience which could help overcome the effects of discrimination and deprivation.
2. . . . the typical riot participant was a high school dropout.
3. The bleak record of public education for ghetto children is growing worse.
4. The vast majority of inner-city schools are rigidly segregated . . . Almost 90 percent of all Negro students attend schools which had a majority of Negro students.
5. . . . strong influence on achievement derives from the tendency of school administrators, teachers, parents, and the students themselves to regard ghetto schools as inferior.
6. . . . both class and race factors have a strong bearing on educational achievement; the ghetto student labors under a double burden.
7. The schools attended by disadvantaged Negro children commonly are staffed by teachers with less experience and lower qualifications than those attended by middle-class whites.
8. Teachers assigned to ghetto schools often begin with negative attitudes toward the students. These attitudes are aggravated by serious discipline problems . . .
9. In virtually every large American city, the inner-city schools attended by Negroes are the most overcrowded.
10. Inner-city schools are not only overcrowded, they also tend to be the oldest and most poorly equipped.
11. The quality of education offered by ghetto schools is diminished further by use of curricula and materials poorly adapted to the life-experiences of their students.
12. Despite the overwhelming need, our society spends less money educating ghetto children than children of suburban families.
13. Teachers of the poor rarely live in the community where they work and sometimes have little sympathy for the life styles of their students.
14. Ghetto schools often appear to be unresponsive to the community, communication has broken down, and parents are distrustful of officials responsible for formulating educational policy. (page 424 ff.)

To alleviate these existing conditions the Commission recommended the following steps:

1. Sharply increased efforts to eliminate de facto segregation.
2. Elimination of racial discrimination in Northern and Southern schools.
3. Extension of quality early childhood education.
4. Substantial federal funding for year-round compensatory education programs, improved teaching, and expanded experimentation and research.
5. Elimination of illiteracy through adult education.
6. Enlarged opportunities for parent and community participation in the public schools.
7. Reoriented vocational education emphasizing work-experience programs and the involvement of business and industry.

8. Expanded opportunities for higher education through increased assistance to disadvantaged students.
9. More per-student aid to districts having high proportion of disadvantaged school-age children. (page 25)

The shocking findings of the President's Commission should not fall on deaf ears--this is a clear call to action. A major responsibility is placed on the shoulders of the nation's educators and that responsibility implies a change in their traditional role. Although a massive transformation of our educational system is required, that alone will not solve the problem. Educators who, as a group, should understand the problems of the disadvantaged must also engage in social and perhaps even political action. Harold Howe has stated that,

> I think, too, that we will not see a genuinely integrated educational system in this country until we have a genuinely desegregated society. Yet if the nation is committed to equality of education opportunity for every American--and I believe it is--we educators must press unrelentingly for desegregated schooling. Giving a child the chance to learn in the best possible environment is the only truly American solution.

The most recent and comprehensive cross-sectional study of the education of disadvantaged students is the Coleman (1966) report, Equality of Educational Opportunity.

Although the report is primarily concerned with elementary and secondary education, it should be of considerable interest to junior college educators since its findings and conclusions point up important implications for the education of disadvantaged students at the post-secondary level.

The following table from the Coleman report illustrates the median achievement test scores at the 1st grade and at the 12th grade of students from various racial or ethnic groups:

TABLE 1

Nationwide Median Test Scores for 1st- and 12th-Grade Pupils, Fall 1965

Test	Racial or Ethnic Group					
	Puerto Ricans	Indian Americans	Mexican-Americans	Oriental Americans	Negro	Majority
1st Grade						
Nonverbal	45.8	53.0	50.1	56.6	43.4	54.1
Verbal	44.9	47.8	46.5	51.6	45.4	53.2
12th Grade						
Nonverbal	43.3	47.1	45.0	51.6	40.9	52.0
Verbal	43.1	43.7	43.8	49.6	40.9	52.1
Reading	42.6	44.3	44.2	48.8	42.2	51.9
Mathematics	43.7	45.9	45.5	51.3	41.8	51.8
General information	41.7	44.7	43.3	49.0	40.6	52.2
Average of 5 tests	43.1	45.1	44.4	50.1	41.1	52.0

Since the scores at each grade level were standardized so that the average over the national sample equaled 50 and the standard deviation equaled 10, the table indicates that the minority pupils' scores are as much as one standard deviation below the majority. Thus, at each grade level the average verbal achievement score for Mexican-Americans and Negroes is equivalent to about the fifteenth percentile for white students. It is important to note that as most minority students progress through the grades the deficiency in the achievement of minority students becomes greater. Coleman concludes,

> For most minority groups, then, and most particularly the Negro, schools provide little opportunity for them to overcome this initial deficiency; in fact, they fall farther behind the white majority in the development of several skills which are critical to making a living and participating fully in modern society. Whatever may be the combination of non-school factors--poverty, community attitudes, low educational level of parents--which put minority children at a disadvantage in verbal and nonverbal skills when they enter the first grade, the fact is the schools have not overcome it. (page 21)

Since the junior college is the institution of higher education which has accepted the major responsibility for the education of disadvantaged students, it is important to understand that the junior college enrolls many such students after they have experienced twelve years of "cumulative deficit" and the concomitant deterioration in attitudes toward academic work, perception of self, intensity of motivation, and level of aspiration. Truly, junior college programs of compensatory education for disadvantaged students must be potent indeed if they are to have any effect upon the achievement of such students.

After establishing that schools have not been effective in raising the achievement of minority students, Coleman turned to the problem of identifying school characteristics which have a significant effect upon the achievement of students when selected personal background characteristics of students are controlled. Wilson, Jensen and Elliott (1966) analyzed the Coleman data and listed twelve school characteristics whose combined effect account for only 2% of the variation in achievement of white students and only 3% of the variation in achievement of Negro students in the twelfth grade. The following is the list of such characteristics:

Per pupil instructional expenditure
Number of volumes per student in school library
Presence of science laboratory facilities
Number of extracurricular activities
Presence of accelerated curriculum
Comprehensiveness of the curriculum
Practice in promotion of slow learners
Grouping or tracking practice
Ease of movement between tracks
School size
Number of guidance counselors
Urbanism of school's location

The same authors also identified the following school characteristics reported in the Coleman study which showed no perceptible relationship to achievement:

Teacher/pupil ratios
Number of specialized rooms in the plant
Availability of separate classes for special students
Age of textbooks

Referring to the effect of the identified characteristics, Wilson, Jensen and Elliott concluded that,

> . . . the fact that their provisions have virtually no effect on measured outcomes is not heartening. It is particularly relevant to the present concern since so many of the special compensatory and enrichment programs which the federal and state government are supporting are based on, or include, elements surveyed in this list without any specialized rationale or assurance of distinction. (pages 32-33)

It should be noted here that most of the programs for disadvantaged students in California junior colleges are based upon or include various characteristics identified by Coleman as being ineffective with respect to student achievement. Nearly all such programs employ remedial courses or special classes. Rouche (1968) also concluded that the typical remedial program in the junior college was ineffective in terms of assisting students to enroll in regular college credit courses. Another characteristic which is usually a part of junior college programs for disadvantaged students is some form of ability grouping. Goldberg, Passow and Justman (1966) concluded that ability grouping was neutral and that its value depended upon the extent to which specific instructional techniques based upon the needs of students are employed. The same authors refer to Daniel's conclusion that the self-fulfilling prophecy may be operating in ability-grouped classes. That is, "A classes get A minded teacher and therefore, A results, while C classes get C minded teachers, C educational aspirations and inevitably C results." (page 11)

Most junior colleges select students for remedial classes and for ability-grouped classes by using some form of standardized testing. Dennis (1967) states that,

> Whatever the precise effect of standard tests has been, one thing is clear: they have been effective devices for screening out Negroes, but not for finding Negro talent. (page 302)

Since, in all probability, standardized tests also discriminate against other disadvantaged students, educators should use them with great care and understanding. It would be well to remember, as Wilson, Jensen and Elliott (1966) have pointed out,

> While social disadvantage results in lowered I.Q. and lowered school achievement, it does not, except in extreme rare cases, result in lowered basic learning ability. (page 12)

The evidence from the studies cited above indicates that junior college educators should give careful consideration to the characteristics, backgrounds and needs of disadvantaged students and to available research on the effectiveness of various instructional strategies and techniques before attempting to establish programs for such students if these special programs are to be effective in raising achievement levels.

After demonstrating that the characteristics already discussed have little, if any, relationship to student achievement, Coleman then stated this major finding as follows:

> Attributes of other students account for far more variation in the achievement of minority group children than do any attributes of school facilities and slightly more than do attributes of staff.
>
> In general, as the educational aspirations and backgrounds of fellow students increase, the achievement of minority group children increases. (page 302)

Wilson's (1966) study in which he controlled not only for variables such as variations in family background, parental supervision and number of siblings but also for differences in I.Q. test scores in the primary grades, extends Coleman's findings. Wilson states that,

> . . . the social-class characteristics of a student's schoolmates make a substantial difference to his subsequent academic development. Significantly, it is the social-class composition--not the racial composition--which makes the difference.

Wilson also reported as a second relevant finding that, "it is the social character of the school--not peers in the immediate neighborhood of the individual--who comprise the educationally relevant social environment."

Obviously, considering both Coleman's findings and Wilson's findings, changes in the racial imbalance in schools must take into consideration not only racial but also social-class characteristics of students.

Again, an important implication for junior colleges, and also some four-year colleges should be mentioned. Although such institutions do face the problem of the cumulative deficit in the achievement of disadvantaged students, they do reap the benefit of a potentially effective student mix in terms of its effect upon student achievement. The student mix would be most effective in those community colleges which are located in a single-college district, if, indeed, the student body is characterized by an adequate student mix, and there is reason to believe that this is often not the case. However, junior college educators should capitalize upon and build upon the apparent effectiveness of a student body which includes students from all social classes and several ethnic and racial groups. Those instructional techniques or strategies which result in the isolating of lower-class students and/or minority students into special classes for most of the time spent on the campus should be carefully studied and evaluated. Do such groupings decrease equality of educational opportunity? Do they actually reduce the effectiveness of instruction in terms of the achievement of disadvantaged students?

Wilson, Jensen and Elliott (1966) recommend, among other things, that federal agencies encourage the establishment of "integrated educational parks linked to research and development programs." (page 52) In a very real sense, the community college is an educational park although it is concerned with only post-high school and adult education. It would be a tragedy to lose the benefits of such a "park" arrangement by imposing inflexible ability grouping arrangements.

The general response to the Coleman Report must be characterized as mixed. In an excellent article Moynihan (1968) describes the reaction of the Office of Education as, ". . . not consternation but something near alarm." (page 25) He also comments on the reactions of three establishments. The educational establishment reacted sluggishly because silence was the best defense. The reform establishment reacted with resistance because the report did not confirm many of their theories. The research establishment reacted with inhibition because of the sensitivity of racial and social class data and the almost complete absence of minority group researchers who might comment with less fear of being accused of racial bias.

Dyer (1968) cites three studies which present findings which contradict the Coleman findings. The first, by Mollenkopf and Melville (1953) identified four characteristics that showed relatively high relationships with the test scores--geographical location, cost of instructional support per pupil, urbanism and the number of specialists in the school staff. (page 42) The second, by Samuel M. Goodman (1958) known as the Quality Measurement Project which found that per pupil expenditure, amount of special staffing, and especially teacher experience were associated with pupil achievement. (page 43) The third, by Marion F. Shaycroft (1960) in connection with Project TALENT which showed that there is a substantial amount of cognitive development between the ninth and the twelfth grade and that it was the quality of schooling that made a significant difference in pupil growth. (page 45)

Dyer stated that the major weaknesses of the Coleman research are that it used cross-sectional rather than longitudinal data, that it depends too much on verbal ability as a measure of student achievement, and that it neglects to show the "possible impact of schools on the development of pupil attitudes and outlook." (page 39) He analyzed Coleman's data in a somewhat different way and concluded that,

> . . . closing the educational gap between the white majority and the colored minorities is going to require more social and educational imagination and sustained effort than has hitherto been typical of most school systems. It is fairly obvious that the school characteristics that turn out to be functional are for the most part of the hard-to-change characteristics, while those that turn out to be non-functional are the easy-to-change characteristics. As a consequence . . . educators will no doubt be having to fight off pressures from without and temptations from within to try to achieve an instant improvement by pouring money into the easy-to-change nonfunctioning features of school systems . . . at the expense of the hard-to-change features that in the long run are more likely to make a real difference in what children become. (page 51)

Pettigrew cited three studies which he stated produced findings which are identical to Coleman's. The studies to which he referred were conducted by Wilson, by Harvard University, and by Michael. (page 68) All of these studies, Pettigrew claimed, substantiate Coleman's major finding that, "children of all backgrounds tend to do better in schools with a predominant middle class milieu; and this trend is especially true in the later grades where the full force of peer group influence is felt." (page 67) Pettigrew also stated that,

> The apparent benefits of interracial classrooms are not linear; in other words, Negroes in predominantly white classrooms score higher on the average, but those in classrooms with "less than half" whites do no better than those in all-Negro classrooms. (page 71)

and that,

> The achievement scores of white children in bi-racial classes with "more than half" white students average just as high as those of comparable children in all-white classes. (page 71)

Pettigrew concluded that,

> . . . integrated education in the early grades seems to have important benefits for both Negro and white children in terms of improved interracial attitudes and preferences--not an unimportant consequence in a nation torn by racial strife and bigotry. (page 75)

Again, the implication for the community college is that methods must be found which will produce integrated classes--and Pettigrew would say predominantly white classes--if the instruction offered is to be effective in terms of the achievement of disadvantaged students. It could be concluded that the ability tracking commonly used in community colleges probably does not improve the achievement of white students and undoubtedly is harmful to minority students.

Katz (1968) reports a study involving low-achieving Negro boys which demonstrated the, "extent to which the child's self-evaluations had affective consequences." (page 59) He found that low achieving Negro boys "seem to have internalized a most effective mechanism for self-discouragement. In a sense, they had been socialized to self-impose failure." He attributes this reaction to a lack of prior rewards for achievement efforts but more importantly, to a "history of punitive reactions by socializing agents to such efforts." (page 60)

Katz also suggests that the unrealistic aspirations Negro parents hold for their children is an important source of anxiety and that such aspirations are inconsistent with the help Negro parents are willing or able to devote to their children's educational needs. As a result, says Katz, Negro children frequently express educational and vocational aspirations which are unrealistic in terms of their educational retardation and are "merely empty statements made for the benefit of the interviewer or expressions of fantasies that have nothing to do with real events." He concluded that, "values and goals have been internalized but not the behavioral mechanisms requisite for attaining them." (page 63)

Thus, it would appear that low-achieving Negro males and, in all probability, other minority group males who come to the junior college must be given opportunities in which they may realistically be expected to succeed and they must be brought to the realization that efforts on their part will be rewarded fairly and consistently. Under other circumstances their tendency to self-impose failure is likely to be an effective block preventing academic achievement.

In a recent article Christopher Jenks (1968) takes a very pessimistic view of the possibility of achieving equality of educational opportunity. He states that,

> Equalizing opportunity, turns out, then, to be inextricably tied up with creating a classless society. Yet this latter ideal is not one to which America has ever devoted much effort, nor is there much sign that it will begin to do so in the near future . . . Until such progress is made, however, the level of social mobility will probably remain at about its present level, and class differences in recruitment to higher education will probably change very little. (page 315)

Jenks feels that reducing college entrance requirements would not significantly affect the proportions of social classes entering. He cited the example of the community college as evidence,

> . . . consider the case of the junior college. These colleges are in many respects the embodiment of what advocates of social mobility should want. The public ones usually cost little more to attend than high school, and very few require their students to demonstrate such "middle class" skills as literacy. They offer a variety curricula, including some designed for the academically apathetic or inept students. Yet the existence of these colleges has not improved the competitive position of the poor in any dramatic way. (pages 304-305)

No comment need be made about Jenks' condescension or his lack of knowledge about the role of the junior college and the characteristics of its students. However, Jenks seems to see nothing but a passive role for colleges in the effort to achieve equal opportunity. Many successful recruitment programs which could be duplicated in almost any college indicate that he is probably not aware of current developments. The article is useful in that it does indicate that equality of educational opportunity will be most difficult to achieve unless a positive recruitment program is a significant part of the effort, and that equality of educational opportunity is tied to the problem of racial stratification. Again, the need for educators to engage in social and political activity is indicated.

Some critics of the Coleman report have called it "racist" because of the major finding that children of lower social-class (minority groups?) achieve greater academic success when they are enrolled in predominantly upper social-class (white?) schools. There appears to be a growing conviction, especially within segregated communities that the answer is not to move students out of their neighborhood schools but to improve the community and the schools--and it is said the ways to improve the neighborhood school is to permit residents of the neighborhood to assume control of the school. The move toward separatism should not be ignored by educators. It represents the struggle of a depressed group seeking identity and dignity. It is the normal reaction of a group which has been for too long denied equal involvement in the mainstream of national life. Consider these comments from students who participated on a panel during a conference on race and poverty in higher education,

> Higher education in California is going to have to cut us in, cut us out, cut us down . . . It has to be changed to incorporate me. The problems of race started with the white community and that is where it has to change.

and,

> The Black Student Union is a pressure group to change that system. Those black students that are not committed to that fight are wasting their time. The college must accept changes that are more relevant to black students. When they don't there is no other avenue.

Consider also this comment by Walton (1968), a black educator in a community college:

> Let no one be deceived and led to believe by enemies of the Black liberation struggle that the Black Curriculum is going to imitate the racist curricula of white America's schools; the present Afro-American Studies program was built into the framework of the white school structure as an expedient measure only. Ideally, Black schools, Black school districts and Black universities are needed, and our children are being told by us that they can change society because they are part of that society. Our children will be exposed daily to the ideal that society must change or DIE! (page 3)

The Mexican-American minority is also becoming more militant in its demands for equality of educational opportunity. Consider for example, the following excerpts from a speech made by Rodolfo Gonzalez, chairman of the Crusade for Justice and editor of El Gallo.

> If the educational system is inadequate, then boycott the system.
>
> Racism must be exposed and we must identify with the problems of all minorities.
>
> If the books in our educational system are racistic, then we must burn them.
>
> We must produce poets, novelists, playwrights, histories and anthologies to make Mexican-Americans aware of their culture and background.

Rather than over-react to such statements, educators should perceive them as evidence of the urgent necessity of involving minority group members in all phases of the educational process. Kenneth Clark states the case for the Negro,

> The Negro cannot any longer feel, if he ever did, that he should have to prove himself "worthy" in order to gain his full freedom--the rights guaranteed to all American citizens, including those recently naturalized . . . The Negro cannot be asked to prove that he "deserves" the rights and responsibilities of democracy, nor can he be told that others must first be persuaded "in heart and mind" to accept him. Such tests and trials by fire are not applied to others. To impose them on the Negro is racist condescension. (page 25)

Increasingly, community college educators will be forced to consider means whereby minority group members can be involved in the institution and its educational program. Increasingly educators will be the object of great pressure from the militant members of minority groups. Educators must learn that such pressure cannot be disregarded or suppressed and they must, above all, understand its root causes and engage in the process of accommodation and reconciliation. Educators must learn to understand the words and actions of the militant minorities. Wicker (1968) identified rebelliousness as a symptom of a grave societal disorder when he stated in an introduction to the Report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders that,

> . . . the rioters are the personification of that nation's shame, of its deepest failure, of its greatest challenge. They will not go away. They can only be repressed or conceded their humanity, and the choice is not theirs to make. They can only force it upon the rest of us, and what this Report insists is that they are really doing it and intend to keep on. (Introduction, page x)

The need to bring the community into the college and to take the college into the community is urgent. If, indeed, the community college is "democracy's college" it should be the first segment of higher education to heed Fischer's (1966) admonition.

> The argument for enlarging the opportunities and enhancing the status of the Negro minority goes far beyond extending a modicum more of charity to the poor. The appeal to equity and to the humane principles that undergird the democratic enterprize is the heart of the matter, to be sure, but the evidence is now irrefutable that until each American has full access to the means to develop his capacities every other American's chances and attainments will continue to be diminished. (page 510)

What Fischer has said for the Negro applies with equal force to all minority groups. In the words of the students, colleges must not "cut them out, cut them down," but must "cut them in" now.

CHARACTERISTICS OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

There is a large and growing body of literature concerned with the characteristics of disadvantaged students. One comprehensive review of such literature is found in Gordon and Wilkerson (1966). A brief summary of the findings of several authorities is presented here. Whenever possible the authority is identified as cited in Gordon and Wilkerson.

As compared to non-disadvantaged students, disadvantaged students:

1. Are less able to make use of standard English in representing and interpreting their feelings, their experiences, and the objects in their environment.
2. Are more frequently retarded in speech development. (Beckey) (Irwin)
3. Frequently use less mature sentence types, simpler sentence construction, and less well-detailed concepts. (Anastasi)
4. Use language which is more restricted in form, serving to communicate signals and directions, and tending to confine thinking to a relatively low level or repetitiveness. (Bernstein)
5. Are increasingly disadvantaged in the use of language--there is a "cumulative deficit." (Deutsch, Hiliard)
6. Tend to be inferior in abstract thinking--emphasis is on content rather than form.
7. Tend to use inductive rather than deductive reasoning. (limits ability to generalize) (Riessman)
8. Tend to depend more on real life encounters than on symbolic experience in developing ideas. (Montague) (Deutsch) (Gordon)
9. Demonstrate perceptual styles and perceptual habits which are either inadequate or irrelevant to the demands of academic efficiency. (Riessman)
10. Frequently have not adopted the modes of listening and speaking which are traditional to and necessary for success in school.
11. More frequently demonstrate cognitive functioning characterized by slowness. (Riessman)
12. Are inferior on tasks requiring concentration and persistence. (Deutsch)
13. More frequently show marked lack of involvement with, attention to, and concentration on the content of their academic experiences.
14. More frequently have poor work habits--frequently exhibit a "so what" attitude. (Deutsch)
15. Are less highly motivated and have lower aspirations for academic and vocational achievement.
16. Are less motivated by symbolic rewards and postponements of gratification.
17. More frequently have goals which tend to be self-centered, immediate, and utilitarian.
18. More frequently show a lack of concern with the aesthetics of knowledge, symbolism as an art form, introspection, and competition with one's self.
19. Have less concern with achievement resulting from parental demands for success. (Bernstein)
20. More frequently hold negative attitudes toward school. (Hieronymus)
21. More frequently view education primarily in terms of its job market value and orientation is pointed toward achieving the minimum level of education commensurate with employability.
22. More frequently exhibit tendencies toward self-depreciation and depressed self-concept. (Freger) (Keller) (Silverman) (page 12 ff)

Bloom, Davis and Hess (1966) have said that many disadvantaged students have developed high levels of hostility and rebellion which interfere with learning and which cause them to be in a continual state of resentment against individuals and forces around them. The same authorities state that,

> The culturally disadvantaged student has all too frequently given up hope for the future. Frustrated by the school's demands and by its repeated punishments (and lack of rewards),

> he sees little relevance in present school learning for the realities he perceives ahead. (page 35)

Increasing academic pressure and removing from the curriculum all of those elements which might enable the disadvantaged student to understand himself as a person and as a member of our society (which seems to be the current official educational philosophy in California) could do incalculable harm to students who are already hostile, rebellious, frustrated, and without hope for the future.

This enumeration of the nature of "disadvantageness" explains quite clearly why disadvantaged students achieve at lower levels than non-disadvantaged students. It indicates, also, why effective compensatory measures are necessary. Perhaps what is most significant is that the listing demonstrates that disadvantaged students are lacking in so many of the qualities that teachers value so highly. Unfortunately, too many teachers perceive disadvantaged students as low-ability students and thus hold low expectations for them. Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1967) studied the effect of teachers' expectations and concluded that,

> The results of the experiment just now described provide further evidence that one person's expectation of another's behavior may serve as a self-fulfilling prophecy. When teachers expected that certain children would show greater intellectual development, those children did show greater intellectual development.

Kenneth Clark (1965) states the problem more succinctly and also more bluntly, "Children who are treated as if they are uneducable invariably become uneducable." (page 128) The implication for instructors of special low-ability, compensatory, and remedial classes is obvious.

It is frequently pointed out that disadvantaged students have many positive qualities which teachers are unaware of, fail to recognize, and fail to build upon in the learning process. Havighurst (1966), however, states that,

> . . . there is substantial doubt that the socially disadvantaged children in our big cities have any positive qualities of potential value in urban society in which they are systematically better than the children of families who participate fully in the mass culture. (page 22)

Kemp (1966), however, lists several strengths of disadvantaged students. She states that,

> Perhaps the greatest source of strength among disadvantaged youth is the resourcefulness with which most of them cope with the difficult conditions of life. (page 4)

She also lists the following "characteristics for learning" of these students:

1. They are creative, motivated,and proficient in areas where their interests lie.

2. They are capable of working well and hard on a specific task or assignment which has purpose for them.

3. They have a capacity for close and loyal personal relationships. This is especially true of relationships with their peers . . .

4. Unusual experiences make a deep impression on them . . . (page 5)

Forbes (1966) has pointed out that Mexican-American children have an advantage over Anglo children because they "possess an entree into two viable languages, both of which . . . can be utilized as vehicles for sound linguistic development." (page 19)

Forbes also states that the Mexican-American student brings to the school many bicultural experiences which may enrich the school environment. (page 19)

Riessman (1966) also has identified positive qualities of disadvantaged students.

> . . . cooperativeness and mutual aid that mark the extended family; the avoidance of strain accompanying competitiveness and individualism; the equalitarianism, in informality and humor; the freedom from self-blame and parental over-protection, the children's enjoyment of each other's company and lessened sibling rivalry, the security found in the extended family and traditional outlook; the enjoyment of music, games, sports, cards; the ability to express anger; the freedom from being word-bound . . . (page 56)

Although it appears that socially-disadvantaged students do have many positive qualities, those qualities are not those most teachers value in their students. In fact, many of the qualities listed above would be perceived as negative in many classroom situations. However, if teachers are made aware of and sensitive to these positive qualities and if learning experiences are designed to capitalize upon such qualities, it is likely that education could be made more relevant and more effective for disadvantaged students.

Programs for disadvantaged students, if they are to be effective, must be constructed in such a way that they deal directly and/or indirectly with the characteristics of disadvantageness which have been revealed through research. Intuitively developed programs have not, and are not likely to increase significantly the achievement of such students. The problems to be solved are overwhelmingly difficult. Unless the relevant research is taken into consideration, compensatory programs will prove to be nothing more than empty gestures at best, and cruel hoaxes at worst.

The research of Stodolsky and Lesser (1967) poses the possibility that the task of constructing compensatory programs is even more difficult than is presently thought. Ability tests (Verbal, Reasoning, Number, Space) were administered to children from several social-class levels of four ethnic groups (Chinese, Jews, Puerto Ricans and Negroes). Stodolsky and Lesser discovered that,

> Ethnic groups are markedly different ($p < .001$) both in absolute level of each mental ability and in the pattern among these abilities. (page 566)

And also,

> More important is the finding . . . ethnicity does affect the pattern of mental abilities and, once the pattern specific to the ethnic group emerges, social-class variations within the ethnic group do not alter this basic organization. (page 567)

Stodolsky and Lesser conclude that,

> However, it is our contention that Coleman's analysis does not go far enough, does not tell the whole story or consider all the evidence, and therefore, is misleading and perhaps destructive. It fails to consider either the role of diversity and pluralism in our society or several alternatives of the function of schooling. Should schools provide equal development of all groups and individuals or equal opportunity for the maximum development of each group or individual? Can schools aim to do both? (page 583)

This research indicates that all hope of developing a single, all-purpose program which is designed to serve the needs of all disadvantaged students should now be abandoned. A far more sophisticated approach is required.

Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) have correctly concluded that most college level compensatory programs and practices

> . . . seem to fit the somewhat dreary pattern of remedial courses which have plagued many generations of low-achieving students with but little benefit to most of them. There is need for fresh approaches in special curricular programs for disadvantaged students at the college level. (page 155)

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Two studies of financial assistance programs in California have indicated that minority group students and students from lower socio-economic classes are not being adequately served by existing programs. The studies also indicate that the traditional scholarship requirements act as effective barriers to financial assistance for many students who do not meet such requirements but who, if given a chance, might succeed in college.

Sanders and Elmer (1965) found that lower and middle-income groups are under-represented in college and recommended that the California State Scholarships be substantially increased. Such an increase, they stated, would result in a significant increase in the number of students from the $4,000 to $10,000 income levels attending college. (page 69) These authors recognize, in addition, that minority groups are markedly under-represented in California colleges. (page xiv) They state that,

> There is ample experience that comparatively few students from non-white and other minority groups qualify as award winners under the present criteria which require very high performance on aptitude tests and in the high school academic program. (page 70)

Sanders and Palmer also recommended that scholarship funds be provided for students who might be selected on the basis of criteria other than those presently used. They suggested that high school principals might select students and refer them to a screening committee. (page 70)

The same study stated that, "By the standards of the remainder of the nation, we have been only moderately successful in making access to college open to all income levels." (page xiv) It is also pointed out that other states are "increasingly stressing the financial aid 'package' as well as orienting programs to financial need as the primary criterion for receipt of awards." (page 1)

A more recent study was completed by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (1967). The report states that the following factors are most important in the college-going decision:

1. student's occupational expectation
2. family income
3. educational levels of both father and mother
4. father's occupation
5. race
6. size of family

The Coordinating Council study pointed out that these variables are highly interrelated in much the same fashion as are three aspects of college-going--eligibility, initial enrollment, and persistence, and that, "With respect to persistence, the most often cited determinant appears to be motivation; finances play an important but secondary consideration." (page 1)

The same report indicated that the average cost of fully supporting a student away from home at a California private college is $3,011 and that of fully supporting a student living at home and attending a junior college is $1,000. The following table adapted from Sanders and Palmer (1965) illustrates the income distribution by college types of parent-supported students.

TABLE 1a

INCOME DISTRIBUTION BY COLLEGE TYPES - PARENT-SUPPORTED STUDENTS

Percentage of Those in Each College Type

Income Class	Junior College	State College	University of California	Private College
$ 0 - 1,999	1.6	0.7	2.9	0.5
2,000 - 3,999	6.2	3.3	2.0	2.9
4,000 - 5,999	15.4	10.0	7.4	5.8
6,000 - 7,999	19.0	16.6	11.0	11.7
8,000 - 9,999	16.4	16.8	12.9	12.4
10,000 - 11,999	13.9	19.5	13.1	13.3
12,000 - 13,999	7.0	10.5	11.2	13.8
14,000 - 19,999	10.7	12.7	20.0	18.0
20,000 - 24,999	2.5	3.2	6.5	7.3
25,000 and over	4.0	4.4	11.6	11.9
No response	3.1	2.4	1.3	2.2
Median Income (approximate)	$8,800	$10,000	$12,000	$12,300
% Parent-supported	49.7	71.5	83.6	97.7

These findings indicate quite clearly that there is a definite relationship between family income and the student's choice of a college. They also indicate that the need for financial assistance appears to be greatest for students enrolled in junior colleges. The study conducted by the Coordinating Council (1967) recognized such a need when it stated that,

> The relatively high reliance upon working aid in the junior colleges indicates that further student assistance should be provided in the form of either loans or grants in order to effectively provide for those in the greater need categories. (page LV-19)

At the same time, the study recognized that the provision of additional loan funds at the junior college level might not significantly increase the enrollment of students from low income groups. The study stated that,

> The objective of equal educational opportunity will not be achieved by offering additional loan assistance to individuals from low-income backgrounds who are less willing (and, presumably, less able) to borrow than individuals from higher economic backgrounds. (page 5)

Thus, the obvious conclusion seems to be that students from low income groups who are enrolled in the junior colleges require financial assistance beyond what is presently available and that such assistance should be provided in the form of grants. Additionally, it might be concluded that since the cost of attending a junior college is much less than that of attending a four-year college, and since the need for grant funds is likely to be substantially above the level likely to be available from all sources, low income students who receive grants should enroll in the junior college for all of their undergraduate work. In this way any given amount of grant funds could be made to serve a larger number of students, many of whom might otherwise not be able to go to college.

Another major conclusion of the Coordinating Council study states succinctly that,

> Existing methods of providing financial assistance to students in California higher education appear to need both modification and an increase in funding. (page 5)

SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Originally, it was planned to include in this present study descriptions of programs in other institutions of higher education in California and, to a lesser degree, programs in other states. Within the time and budgetary limits imposed on the study this did not prove to be possible. However, since the Martyn (1966) report has been revised by Smart (1968) and since there is an abundance of literature available describing action on the national scene, the concentration of this present study on the junior colleges of California probably represented the most prudent use of the limited amount of time and money available. It might be well, however, to refer briefly to a few of the sources of information available to those seeking information about programs of compensatory education. Obviously, it is not possible here to review the vast number of articles which have appeared in the professional journals.

It would probably be a mistake for university, college, and junior college educators to confine their study or programs to those which have been established in higher education. Many imaginative and innovative approaches have been tried at the elementary and secondary levels and many of these approaches are applicable to institutions of higher education. Indeed, there is some evidence to support the view that educators at the lower levels have been more imaginative and innovative than their colleagues in higher education.

Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) present an excellent review of many compensatory programs and practices in both elementary and secondary education and in higher education. Especially valuable is their Directory of Compensatory Practices which includes brief descriptions of programs and persons to contact for additional information. (page 199)

Reference has already been made to the Martyn (1966) report and to the revision of that report by Smart (1968). Although the latter has not yet been published and distributed it does indicate a significant increase in the number of programs for disadvantaged students in higher education.

A recent publication of the Southern Education Reporting Service by John Edgerton (1968) describes programs of compensatory education in many public and private colleges and universities. Much of the information contained in the Introduction and in a section entitled, "Some General Observations" are of considerable interest.

A highly valuable source of current information is the IRCD Bulletin, a publication of the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged. It is stated in the Bulletin that,

> The IRCD Bulletin is a bi-monthly publication of the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged. It is published five times a year and usually includes status of interpretive statements, book reviews, and a selected bibliography on some aspect of the center's special areas.

A similar publication is issued periodically by the Bureau of Special College Programs, Division of Higher Education, State Department of Education, Albany, New York. That publication is entitled, Collegiate Newsletter on the Disadvantaged. Information about the Newsletter may be obtained from Donald M. Winkleman of the Bureau of Special College Programs.

Many articles and studies concerning programs for educationally disadvantaged students are available from the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, Powell Library Building, Los Angeles, California 90024.

A wealth of other information is available to those planning a program of compensatory education at any level. However, since it has been noted in this present study that published reports and written descriptions of programs and practices differ in some respects from reality, educators are advised to make personal observations of programs which seem to be of interest and which seem to be applicable to their particular situation and needs. As Munday (1968) has observed,

> Possibly in no other area of educational research is it more difficult for the researcher to maintain his objectivity. Most investigators of disadvantaged programs are neither detached nor disinterested in the outcomes of their studies. If they do have a commitment to the underprivileged in general, they do to the objectives of the specific program on which they are working. They wish to find that students have made extensive educational gains as a result of the special program. (page 1)

SECTION III - METHODOLOGY

DEFINITIONS

In a study of this nature it is necessary to adopt a definitional framework, at the same time recognizing the impossibility of complete precision in structuring a definition of the term "socio-economically disadvantaged." Martyn (1966) has pointed out the diversity of definitions that have been used and has indicated that most of the institutions surveyed in his study defined the socio-economically disadvantaged in the economic terms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The basic definition used for the present study corresponds closely to that of Martyn and is as follows: The socio-economically disadvantaged person of college age is one who comes from a family which has had a long-term pattern of very low income. Two other conditions are very likely to exist. Frequently such a person lives in a slum or ghetto or in a very poor rural area, and very likely he is also a member of a minority racial or ethnic group. These two sociological correlates of the basic economic condition form a syndrome which was used as a working definition when inquiring about the numbers of disadvantaged students at the various colleges visited. The education and occupational level of the father are two other factors closely related to economic level, housing conditions and race. It will be seen in Section IV that a combination of all these variables were used in determining whether or not a student should be considered socio-economically disadvantaged. There are two other corollaries of the basic definition.

1. In most cases such a disadvantaged person will not have had, in childhood and in youth, the kind or extent of cultural experiences in the home and outside of school that enhance his chance of adequate academic performance in school, and

2. If, at attaining college age, such a disadvantaged person has this lack of background experience, he is very unlikely to succeed in the regular program offerings in public higher education in California unless he is assisted by special help or extra programs.

It is recognized that the term "culturally different" is frequently used, and another approach to defining the condition of being disadvantaged stresses minority group membership, often in combination with poverty. This is a definition which is preferred by some members of the minority community. It is clear that in functional terms this definition differs very little from that given above, but for the purposes of this study it seems most appropriate to use poverty (with its sociological concomitant) as the basis, rather than minority group membership per se.

One further point is worth making. This is simply that the term socio-economically disadvantaged can come, almost unconsciously, to be regarded as a relatively permanent state descriptive of an individual. A much more realistic and educationally fruitful conceptualization of this term is to think of the social and economic background of the student putting him at a disadvantage in academic competition, until this disadvantage is overcome through special efforts of the college.

APPROACH

In view of the purposes described in Section I, and because of the involvement of the Junior College Advisory Panel whose recommendations led to the contract supporting this work, the focus of this study is the California junior college. Of primary concern are specific efforts being made to help socio-economically disadvantaged students or potential students who would otherwise be very unlikely to succeed in regular junior college offerings. It will be seen in Section IV that almost all programs resulting from these efforts are not designed specifically for the socio-economically disadvantaged, but rather for the educationally disadvantaged. These two terms are not necessarily synonymous. One of the difficulties in attempting to study the effect California junior colleges are having on the disadvantaged students is actually to identify those who are disadvantaged. (It will be seen later that one of the aspects of the present study is an attempt to do this.) This study is concerned with the effectiveness of junior college efforts in helping the socio-economically disadvantaged group, regardless of others served by the same efforts.

It is possible to distinguish at least three different groups of disadvantaged young people who may be served by such special efforts. First, there are enrolled students who have in the past been underachievers but who may be significantly helped by special programs. Second, there are enrolled students who may be unsuccessful in any junior college program, even with substantial special help. This possible lack of success may be due to psychological or physiological factors, or it may be due to some inadequacy of the special program. The third group are those of college age who, because of economic reasons or lack of motivation, are not now in any educational program.

Special programs which may be effective in helping the disadvantaged student may take a number of forms such as special classes, tutoring, extra counseling, financial aid, transportation, special recruitment and the taking of some of the college offerings out into the community. Where any of these programs exist there are many characteristics to investigate in order to get a reasonably complete picture. Since this study is not designed to test specific hypotheses, but rather to collect as much data as possible about what programs exist and how effective such programs are, the research model is that of a descriptive survey.

In order to collect data in adequate detail, it was decided to visit those junior colleges which appeared to be making some significant special efforts, and to interview in considerable depth both faculty members and administrators involved in these efforts. These visits not only enabled getting first-hand information on the details of the programs but also helped in getting data from two other sources important for this study.

First was the opportunity to get face-to-face information from administrators on such points as goals of programs, general faculty attitudes, budget limitations, the recruiting of disadvantaged students and the administrators' feelings about the special needs of the disadvantaged and the effectiveness of the California junior colleges in meeting these needs.

Second was the opportunity to administer directly the student questionnaire, in order to explain it personally to the students, and to assure them of their anonymity in the analysis of the results.

THE DATA OBTAINED

Programs and attitudes

In order to identify those colleges which should be visited, a Preliminary Question Form and cover letter was sent out early in September, 1967, to all 80 of the California public junior colleges open at that time. Appendix A contains this form and letter, and the responses to the form are shown in Table 2. Study of these responses, taking into account the estimated percentage of disadvantaged students and any reports of special instructional or counseling services, as well as reports of recruiting attempts, led to the initial identification of colleges to visit. During the course of the study continued attempts were made, through asking questions at various colleges visited, to learn of other colleges which should be visited but which had not been identified as such from the Preliminary Question Form. In order to make sure that no significant programs were overlooked, a Final Question Form and cover letter were sent out near the end of April, 1968, to all those institutions which had not been visited or scheduled for a visit. (See Appendix D) From the responses to the Final Question Form, two additional colleges were included for visits. A total of 31 colleges were visited during the course of the study. These institutions are listed in Table 3. As indicated previously, the approach to gathering detailed information about existing programs and policies, as well as other information about the college and the community, was through the use of interviews with administrators and with faculty members involved in such programs. Detailed and separate interview schedules were developed covering the following areas: Special classes, special counseling, special tutoring, special transportation, special assistance in obtaining employment and special financial aid. Each of these interview schedules contained a large number of questions, many of which were suggested by Peralta Junior College District staff members experienced in working with disadvantaged students. The primary aim in using these schedules was to be sure that no aspect of a particular program was inadvertently overlooked when visiting a college. However, there were many cases in which parts of an interview schedule simply did not apply to the particular program being investigated. The schedules were, therefore, used as guides and reminders for collecting descriptive information rather than as questionnaire-type instruments. Another schedule was developed for interviews with administrators. This schedule consisted not only of some questions about specific activities at the college, but also some general attitudinal questions which will be discussed in Section IV.

The initial step in setting up a visit at a particular college was to send a letter to whoever had responded to the Preliminary Question Form. Most often this was the president of the college but occasionally was a dean or other administrative official. In this letter the purpose of the study was described in some detail and a request was made for interview appointments with several individuals. These requests varied depending upon the type of program reported on the Preliminary Question Form, but almost always included the president, the dean of instruction, the dean of student personnel, and one or more instructors or counselors close to the particular program in question. At the 31 colleges, a total of 136 structured interviews were held, each approximately one hour long. The time consumed for this, together with the time needed to administer the student questionnaire, usually required a two-day visit to each college. In almost every case excellent cooperation was obtained, not only in the setting up of appointments to interview faculty members and administrators but also in the courtesies extended during the actual visits to the colleges.

Information from students

For a study of this nature, information from students may be very important, and for this purpose the Student Questionnaire was developed. This instrument is shown in its entirety in Appendix B, although the mimeographed form which was given to the students was less crowded together and allowed more space for the students to answer the questions. Except for this difference in format, Appendix B shows the questionnaire exactly as the students received it.

This questionnaire is a survey instrument. There were no pre-conceived hypotheses underlying its development. Rather, it was felt important to try to get information in all areas that might be relevant to the whole problem of serving the needs of the disadvantaged.

At each of the colleges, an attempt was made to administer the questionnaire in classes that faculty or administrators felt would be likely to have a significant number of disadvantaged students, according to the working definition given earlier in this Section. Usually this questionnaire administration involved two or three sections of a basic or remedial class in an area such as reading or psychology, although there were several variations from this. Questionnaires were administered to a total of 1068 students in 24 of the 31 colleges studied. For a variety of reasons, it was not possible to get student data from the other seven.

With almost no exceptions, the questionnaire was directly explained and administered by one of the two investigators conducting this study, which was described to the students in terms of its potential for generally improving junior college education in California. No reference was made to disadvantaged students. It was carefully explained that the questionnaires were completely anonymous, that they would not be shown to anyone at the college, and that the only information from them that might be provided the college would be in the form of response percentages or averages. The students were asked to answer the questions as they really felt. The care and time taken for the questionnaires by most students leads to the conclusion that the great majority did indeed respond as they felt.

TABLE 2

	American River	Antelope Valley	Bakersfield	Barstow**	Butte	Cabrillo	Cerritos	Chabot	Chaffey	Citrus	Coalinga	Compton	Contra Costa	Cuesta	Cypress	Desert	Diablo Valley	East Los Angeles	El Camino	Foothill	Fresno	Fullerton	Gavilan	Glendale	Golden West	Grossmont	Hancock (Allan)
Estimated percentages of student body considered disadvantaged:	b*	a	b		b	a	a	b	a	a	d	e	c	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	c	a	f	a	b	a	a
Predominant ethnic group of those disadvantaged:																											
Negro	X		X		X						X	X	X				X					X					
Mexican-American	X		X		X	X				X	X					X		X		X		X	X			X	
Caucasian	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X				X		X			X	X		X
Provision for educational needs:																											
In the regular instructional program		X				X	X		X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
In a special instructional program	X		X		X			X			X					X	X			X				X			
Counseling services:																											
Regular service only			X			X	X			X	X							X	X				X	X	X		X
Additional individual counseling	X	X			X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X			X	X	
Additional group counseling	X				X			X	X			X								X					X		
Attempt to recruit disadvantaged:	X		X		X	X						X	X	X			X	X		X	X		X		X		

*a = 0-10%; b = 11-20%; c = 21-30%; d = 31-40%; e = 41-50%; f = Over 50%
**Barstow - The college simply responded that no programs had been developed

TABLE 2 (Continued)

	Hartnell***	Imperial Valley	Laney	Lassen	Long Beach City	Los Angeles City	Los Angeles Harbor	Los Angeles Pierce	Los Angeles Trade-Tech.	Los Angeles Valley	Marin	Merced	Merritt	MiraCosta	Modesto Junior	Moorpark	Monterey Peninsula	Mt. San Antonio	Mt. San Jacinto	Napa	Orange Coast	Palomar	Palo Verde	Pasadena City	Porterville	Redwoods	Reedley
Estimated percentages of student body considered disadvantaged:		c*	c	a	b	c	a	a	b	a	b	b	c	b	b	a	a	a	a	b	a	a	d	b	b	b	b
Predominant ethnic group of those disadvantaged:																											
Negro			X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X			X		X				X	X			
Mexican-American		X			X			X		X		X				X			X				X	X	X		X
Caucasian				X	X					X	X	X			X			X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
Provision for educational needs:																											
In the regular instructional program		X	X		X		X	X				X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X	X
In a special instructional program					X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X				X	X			X	X			
Counseling services:																											
Regular service only		X			X		X						X			X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Additional individual counseling			X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X				X	X			X
Additional group counseling					X	X					X		X						X								
Attempt to recruit disadvantaged:		X			X				X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X			X			X	

*a = 0-10%; b = 11-20%; c = 21-30%; d = 31-40%; e = 41-50%; f = Over 50%
***Hartnell - No response was received

TABLE 2 (Continued)

	Rio Hondo	Riverside City	Sacramento City	San Bernardino Valley	San Diego Jr. College Dist.	San Francisco City	San Joaquin Delta	San Jose City	San Mateo	Santa Ana	Santa Barbara City	Santa Monica City	Santa Rosa Junior	Sequoias	Shasta	Sierra	Siskiyous**	Solano	Southwestern	Taft	Ventura	Victor Valley	West Valley	Yuba
Estimated percentages of student body considered disadvantaged:	a*	a	a	a	b	a	b	a	a	b	b	a	a	b	a	c		c	d	a	a	a	a	b
Predominant ethnic group of those disadvantaged:																								
Negro		X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X						X				X		X
Mexican-American	X	X			X			X				X	X	X				X				X	X	X
Caucasian	X				X					X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Provision for educational needs:																								
In the regular instructional program	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
In a special instructional program		X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X			X			X			X		X	
Counseling services:																								
Regular service only		X		X											X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Additional individual counseling	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X						
Additional group counseling			X		X			X		X	X		X					X						
Attempt to recruit disadvantaged:	X			X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X								X

*a = 0-10%; b = 11=20%; c = 21=3-%; d = 31=40%; e = 41-50%; f = Over 50%

**Siskiyous - The college simply responded that no program had been developed

TABLE 3

COLLEGES VISITED

American River College
Bakersfield College
City College of San Francisco
Coalinga College
College of Marin
College of San Mateo
Compton College
Contra Costa College
Diablo Valley College
East Los Angeles College
Fresno City College
Grossmont College
Laney College
Long Beach City College
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Southwest College
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
Merced College
Merritt College
MiraCosta College
Modesto Junior College
Napa College
North Orange County Junior College District Office
Pasadena City College
Riverside City College
Sacramento City College
San Diego City College
San Joaquin Delta College
San Jose City College
Santa Ana Junior College
Santa Barbara City College

Attitudes of faculty members

Another very important area is that of faculty attitudes toward junior college programs and policies for disadvantaged students, and of faculty feelings about the students themselves. Since those faculty members interviewed for the purpose of obtaining information about specific programs represent a very small and unrepresentative fraction of junior college faculty in California, it was felt that information should be obtained from a much larger and more representative sample. The Faculty Questionnaire (shown with the cover letter in Appendix C) was developed to assess attitudes toward different types of efforts for disadvantaged students and toward some of the points raised in the literature.

The groups to which the questionnaires were sent consisted of essentially all California junior college counselors and approximately ten percent of all the teaching faculty, including librarians. For each college, the number of counselors was obtained from the faculty list in the 1967-68 catalog. From the same (alphabetical) list, taking every tenth name of those teaching provided the ten percent sample of this group. No administrators were included.

At the end of April, 1968, 1719 questionnaires with their cover letters and individual return envelopes were sent out. Approximately one-third went to the counselors and two-thirds to the sample of the teaching faculty.

For each college, the questionnaire materials were sent to the president, with a letter requesting distribution to all the counselors and to those of the teaching faculty whose names were supplied. It was suggested that if the list of teaching faculty contained the name of a person no longer in that position, that questionnaire simply be given to the next faculty member in alphabetical order.

One follow-up letter was sent out, and at the time the results were analyzed a total of 1170 returns had been received, representing 68 percent.

Information from Final Question Form

The Final Question Form (Appendix D) was designed not only to try to identify remaining colleges which ought to be visited, but also to collect information on studies of and plans for disadvantaged students. At the end of April, 54 forms were sent out and of these 47 were returned.

SECTION IV - COLLEGE PROGRAMS

DESCRIPTIONS

This section of the study contains brief descriptions of programs in various California community colleges. The order in which the programs are presented is random and implies no qualitative difference. A few of the colleges visited have not been described because their programs are in the early stages of planning or have been discontinued.

One of the major difficulties encountered during the visits to colleges was that the great majority of junior colleges do not identify disadvantaged students. Thus, most of the programs described here were actually established for low ability students, or for those students whose high school achievement or college entrance test scores were low. Administrators, counselors, and instructors all agreed, however, that most of the disadvantaged students at the college would be found in these classes or programs. There is some evidence which indicates that many educators believe that most disadvantaged students are low ability students. Indeed, practically all junior colleges continue to program students into ability-level tracks or courses based upon the score received on entrance tests.

San Jose City College

San Jose City College serves urban San Jose and the surrounding country area. The college has an enrollment of approximately 4,300 during the day, and 5,500 in the evening. Estimates from members of the college staff place the percentage of disadvantaged students between ten and twenty, with Mexican-Americans making up the majority but also with significant numbers of Negro students. It is also estimated that there may be as high as 45 percent of the population of the whole area that are Mexican-American and that there are undoubtedly large numbers of disadvantaged young people belonging to this ethnic group who are not coming to the college.

The college is making a special effort to reach disadvantaged youth through its Special Education Project, started in the summer of 1967 as an experimental program growing out of the concern of one of the counselors and a few of the faculty members in the English department. From this project, students are actively recruited from the high schools, with two of the important selection criteria being economic need and potential for college work. Students considered for the project are interviewed individually at the college, and a decision is made, by both the counselor and the student, about the value of the project to the particular student. In addition to financial need, the student's commitment to college work is explored with him. Most of those selected for the project are Mexican-American or Negro.

Thirty students were enrolled in the program during the summer of 1967. Two instructors and the counselor who has all the project students as his counselees were involved. Courses were given in guidance, psychology, and English. Tutoring was provided on a one-to-one basis whenever possible. The project students attended classes in the morning and each worked in the afternoon for a total of ten hours a week at the rate of $1.50 per hour. Funds for this work experience were provided by the college. Free lunches were provided from student body funds.

In the fall of 1967, about thirty more new students had the same courses and tutoring, although the courses were spread out over the entire semester. During the spring of 1968, the tutoring was changed, so that it was conducted entirely on a one-to-one basis. About thirty more students started in the spring, and by mid-spring, of the approximately 90 students who had been in the program at some time since its inception, 54 were still in college. A similar and somewhat larger program is planned for the summer of 1968.

Those faculty members involved with the Special Education Project feel that there are some significant advantages that the summer program has over that offered during the academic year. The summer schedule runs for only six weeks, and the contacts among the students, tutors and faculty are concentrated. Since San Jose City College does not have a large regular summer session, the project students have the campus facilities more available and more to themselves. It was indicated that during the last summer program considerable esprit de corps developed for all those involved.

Problems that were reported include difficulties with transportation, the need for more paid employment time for the students, and the fact that the tutoring center facilities are not adequate. For the 1968 summer program an effort was being made to get local employers to hire the students for four hours of work per day, but to pay them for eight, since financial inducements of this type are very important in getting low-income students to attend college.

The importance of the tutors was also stressed. Tutors are chosen for their competence in the subject areas covered and for their attitudes toward the project students. An attempt is made to recruit tutors that can become role-models, and to avoid those that appear to be "do-gooders." Minority group members are actively sought. There are about thirty tutors, paid $2 per hour and working ten hours per week. A few of these are "supervising tutors" who work an additional ten hours a week. During the academic year, these tutors are available to all students at the college.

The value of paying tutors, especially those of Mexican-American background, was pointed out by one instructor who commented that the fact that they are "paid for using their heads" is effective in changing the attitudes held by some Mexican-American parents that their children ought immediately to go to work to earn money, instead of wasting time in college.

Riverside City College

Riverside City College, with an enrollment of approximately 7,000, reported that ten percent or less of its student body are considered socio-economically disadvantaged, and that this group is predominantly Negro and Mexican-American.

The college has employed a Specialist in Extension of Educational Opportunity, who not only works on the development of programs for disadvantaged students, but also serves as liaison between the college and community agencies and other groups.

Specific programs have been developed for the summer periods, starting in 1967. An effort is made to recruit students who otherwise probably would not consider attending college, and referral sources include Neighborhood Youth Corps workers, high school counselors, probation officers, and welfare workers. Students are eligible for the special summer program if they are in or beyond the eleventh grade. During the summer of 1968, students will take courses in orientation to college and in psychology, plus an elective which can be Afro-American history or Mexican-American history. Extended field trips are an important part of the program in helping to develop a feeling of unity among the students through sharing cultural experiences and living together. For the summer of 1968 only 60 of 175 students who have applied can be accommodated.

The Evening Division of the North Orange County Junior College District

The adult education program of the Evening Division of the North Orange County Junior College District is an example of a very significant type of program of direct benefit to the disadvantaged. Other districts, including, Long Beach, Modesto, and Pasadena, also have extensive adult evening programs, but since the present study is primarily focused on programs that help serve the needs of the disadvantaged of college age, adult programs as such were not systematically investigated. However, it was felt important to include in this report a brief description of at least one adult evening program, and that of the North Orange County Junior College District is certainly one of the more comprehensive ones.

It is estimated that between five and ten percent of the adults living in this district are disadvantaged, and that most of these are Mexican-Americans. Between 400 and 450 separate evening classes are offered, and the director of the Evening Division indicated that of these classes, 50 to 100 directly serve the needs of the disadvantaged in two distinct ways. First, there are classes for cultural enrichment, including offerings in citizenship and in English as a second language. Second, there are a group of low-level courses to provide skills for entry into certain vocational areas, an example being a nurse's aide class. One of the significant strengths of a program of this kind is its flexibility; classes can be offered when and where the need arises, on a long or short term basis. In the planning of the offerings, community groups and citizens advisory committees are actively involved. When instructors and counselors are hired, attempts are made to get members of minority groups, and four of the eight evening counselors now are. Counseling interviews are required for those taking courses for high school credit, and counselors are also chosen on the basis of their knowledge of the diploma requirements of the high schools in the area. Credit for the evening classes may be applied toward a high school diploma but not toward an A. A. degree at either of the district's two junior colleges. The counseling offices are in the District Education Center building, but there is also a team of three Mexican-American counselors who go out into the community to help people unfamiliar with college procedures to get started. Some of the classes are in the community in churches, neighborhood centers, and similar locations. Some buses are run between relatively isolated parts of the district and the regular district classroom facilities. Funds for the support of the Evening Division come in part from Federal sources, in part from State aid, and in part from the regular budget of the district.

Merced College

Merced College is a small city college with an enrollment of approximately 3,000. On the Preliminary Question Form it was reported that 11 to 20 percent of the students were disadvantaged.

Although the college is relatively new, a Financial Aids Officer has been appointed and forty scholarships averaging about one hundred dollars each are available. The college also offers State Guaranteed Loans, Educational Opportunity Grants, and has over 100 students in its federal Work Study program. The college's financial aid bulletin states that, "No one is prevented from attending Merced College, Merced, California, due to lack of funds." Not many community colleges are able to make such a statement.

Two National Defense Education Act grants for special counseling for provisional students, many of whom are disadvantaged, have been received. The first grant provided additional counseling within the junior college. The second grant will permit a junior college counselor to spend up to 2/3 of his time in the feeder high schools and in the community encouraging disadvantaged students to enroll in the junior college. The same grant will also provide funds which will be used to being high school counselors into the junior college for orientation and information.

The college is conducting an interesting experiment in combining a remedial English course with a orientation type psychology course. Students who score below the 20th percentile on the entrance test are enrolled in this course. No formal or informal evaluation has been conducted but a staff member stated that he felt the combination course was a promising approach and that it would be especially effective for disadvantaged students since it ties the improvement of communication skills to the everyday, immediate concerns of students.

During the summer of 1968 the college initiated the Planada Project which was a pilot program funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. A community worker will work in the unincorporated area of Planada which lies within the boundaries of the district and which is inhabited by Mexican-Americans most of whom live at or near the poverty level. The program is specifically aimed at adults. A community advisory committee will be established. Extensive home visits will be undertaken. The primary goal is to change adult attitudes toward education.

It is believed that one of the major reasons that college age students who live in the Planada area do not enroll in the college is because their parents would rather have them find employment and contribute to family income. Previous attempts at offering classes in the Planada community have not been successful.

Long Beach City College

Long Beach City College is an urban two-campus college serving the city of Long Beach. One campus is known as the Liberal Arts Campus, and the other the Business and Technology Campus. The total enrollment at both campuses for day and evening full-time and part-time students is approximately 23,000. The college estimates that between eleven and twenty percent of the student body might be considered socio-economically disadvantaged, with roughly equal numbers of Negro, Mexican-American and Caucasian students.

A very interesting project at this college is located on the Business and Technology Campus, and is known as the Programmed Learning Center. This is a large room equipped with a variety of programmed instructional equipment. Three instructors are involved, with one serving as the coordinator in charge of the program and having responsibility for choosing equipment, coordinating schedules, and working with the users in their learning problems.

The Learning Center is open not only to students at the college but also to members of the community, some of whom are referred by such agencies as the State Department of Employment and the State Department of Rehabilitation. It is estimated that about 150 persons are served at any given time, and that of this number 15 percent may be functionally illiterate adults, 50 percent may be adults seeking a General Educational Development certificate or seeking to complete high-school diploma requirements, and the balance are college students. The college students may be foreign-born, may be educationally disadvantaged, or may be any student wishing to master some specific subject area. Anyone desiring to use the facility must make a specific time commitment to one of the blocks of time established by the coordinator.

Certain important advantages, especially for the disadvantaged student, were reported by the coordinator. A student can begin work immediately without wasting time waiting for a class to open. He works at his own speed and competes only with himself. Disadvantaged students sometimes experience embarrassment in a class situation or even with a tutor and they often find it difficult to learn by one method, such as by listening or reading only. In the Learning Center the student is his own teacher and uses a multi-media approach to learning. Thus, several potential problems are avoided.

For several years the college has recognized the need to move out into the community and to involve community groups and public agencies in the affairs of the college. During the 1967-68 academic year courses were taught in over 40 off-campus locations. A program for off-campus counseling is in the planning stage in cooperation with the Community Improvement League. In the past the college has cooperated with the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the California State Employment Service and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation in various projects. The college actively searches for community needs which may be met by short-term courses.

The counseling departments at both campuses are aware of the importance of identifying and giving special assistance to disadvantaged students. Sometimes such students are identified at the high school and sometimes during the registration process. On an informal basis a group of Negro disadvantaged students were referred to a Negro counselor who established a "home base" for them. They meet several times during the year as a group. Usually these meetings deal with college problems but were occasionally social. The counselor assisted the students in job placement, registration, transcripts, transportation to and from school,and many other matters. There was some indication that the program would be formalized in the near future.

The counselors are also giving the students special assistance in moving from one ability level of an academic subject to another when that seems to be necessary. Some effort has been made to identify instructors who understand and are sympathetic to the special needs of disadvantaged students and to program such students into their classes.

Coalinga College

Coalinga College serves a rural district 120 miles long and 80 miles wide. The college has an enrollment of approximately 600 of which 30 to 40 percent (most of whom are Mexican-American students) are estimated by the college to be disadvantaged.

Because of the size of the district and the low-income level of many of the residents, the college operates five buses, which bring students to the college each morning from various parts of the district and return them in the late afternoon. Approximately 200 students are provided this transportation. Approximately another 200 live in Coalinga and the remaining 200 live in dormitory facilities on the campus itself.

If requested, the college will try to provide any course at an off-campus location, usually in one of the high schools. About 65 classes were given during the 1967-68 year at various places in the district.

On the campus, the class offerings which provide the most help for disadvantaged students are in the communications area, with a remedial reading and writing class meeting five days a week required for those students who score below 15 on the English section of the ACT test. A second semester of reading may be required if the instructor feels the students especially need this additional work. During the fall semester of 1967, this program served 130 students during the day and an additional 30, mostly Mexican-American adults, in the evening. The communications classes are taught by one instructor trained for this type of work, who is able to come to know personally all the students in the program. Much emphasis is placed on individual work, with some tutoring by other students at the college. The program is essentially remedial, not designed as preparatory for more advanced courses. No one fails, since the instructor feels that these students have experienced failure too frequently in the past.

There has been some systematic evaluation of the program showing that of those starting in this basic course 35 percent now get the Associate of Arts degree, compared to only one percent of an academically similar group able to complete the degree before the program was initiated. It was also found that these students had better grade-point averages, and that more went on to four-year schools.

College of Marin

The College of Marin is located in Kentfield, one of the towns in Marin County, which is primarily a suburban area of the northern end of San Francisco Bay.

One of the significant efforts of this college has been the establishment of a separate Communications Department for students whose verbal skills are not adequate to qualify them for transfer courses in English. This department, with five full-time instructors during the 1967-68 year, offers Communications 50, a three-unit writing course; Communications 60, a three-unit reading course; a two semester sequence of courses in the mass media of communications; and courses in reading, writing, and speaking for foreign students. During the spring of 1968, a total of 400 students were either in Communications 50 or 60 or both. One of the sections of writing and one of reading are for Negro adults. This grew out of the initial efforts of a group of Negro women living in Marin City, a Negro neighborhood, who were seeking ways to improve and serve the area in which they live. Eventually, special sections of these communications classes were established with an initial enrollment of eleven adults in the fall of 1967 and twelve in the spring of 1968. Some of these adult students also take other courses at the college. Involved faculty at the college feel that although these adult sections are not large, they are important to have on the campus, not only for the benefits to those directly served, but also in helping the younger Negro students feel more at home at the college, since most of the adults are personally known to the college-age group.

The communications courses were started a few years ago by some of the English instructors who wanted to do something to help the students who were failing in the transfer English courses. Eventually, these courses were established as comprising a separate department, now occupying its own building. The physical separation of the Communications Department is felt important at the college in that it provides a "home base" and source of identity for the students in the department. The atmosphere in the building is informal, with coffee readily available and faculty offices easily accessible and near the classroom facilities. Staff members are selected specifically for their interest and background in teaching communications classes of this type.

Another thrust at the College of Marin is a systematic counseling program for black students. This actually starts in the feeder high schools, where one of the regular college counselors makes a special effort to get acquainted with these students and to begin to ascertain special needs, including the need for summer jobs. When the students are enrolled at the College of Marin, their academic work, financial needs, and other problems and potentials are carefully and individually followed. This intensive counseling is facilitated considerably by the fact that the college has a two-year NDEA grant for a research study of the patterns of persistence of black students, and the counselor in charge of this is greatly helped by the presence of a Negro research assistant. Part of the reason that such close contact with these students is possible is of course the fact that there is a total of only about 65 black students at the college, almost all coming from one high school. It is claimed by the college that every black student who qualifies can be in a work-study program if he wishes.

At the College of Marin, some tutoring is available, although this effort is hampered by lack of money for paying tutors. A pilot project started in spring of 1968 is a special center for independent study, which is a room having some programmed instructional equipment supervised by a counselor on a half-time assignment for this work. There are also two student assistants.

For the past five years, the College of Marin has had a special summer program primarily for minority group young people. The program consists of course work in communications and reading, and some group counseling. Individual tutoring is also a part of the program. The aim is to get minority students to the college, to help them improve in basic academic skills, and to encourage them to remain for the regular fall term. Work-study jobs in the community, also a part of the summer program, provide financial enticement for the students. The number served each summer is now between 50 and 60.

The total number of socio-economically disadvantaged students is estimated by people at the College of Marin to be between 200 and 400. Except for the approximately 65 black students, these are essentially all Caucasian.

Information from the high schools and from a recent study made for the county by an independent firm leads the college administration to believe that seventy to eighty percent of the high school graduates go on to a college, with approximately fifty percent of these graduates attending the College of Marin. In the county there are not many low-income areas, but there is a feeling that there are some areas in which American Indian disadvantaged students live who are not coming to the college.

San Diego City College

San Diego City College is one of the two community colleges operated by the San Diego Unified School District. The college has a day enrollment of approximately 3,000 students. It is located near the commercial center of the city. Although the curriculum is comprehensive, it is heavily weighted toward the vocational offerings.

The college conducts a block program of special classes called the General Studies Program. This program was not designed specifically for disadvantaged students but rather for students whose achievement and entrance test scores are low. The program has been operating for several years but it was not until the beginning of the 1967-68 academic year that a half-time staff member was appointed as a coordinator. It is the hope of the college that by "customizing" some of the offerings, students who might have considerable difficulty in a more traditional college program can find some success. The program also offers students an opportunity to learn something about themselves and to improve their basic skills.

During the 1967-68 academic year this program consisted of four courses: General Studies 2, which is a 1½-unit, nine-week course dealing with career planning and occupations; General Studies 3, another 1½-unit, nine-week course dealing with study methods; General Studies 60, a 3-unit basic English course; and English 10, a 1-unit course in reading.

Entering students whose scores on the English section of the ACT fall below 10 would normally be required to enroll in the program. However, since there are not enough sections of the program to accommodate all such students, many are permitted to enter the regular program. (Only 125 of the 300 students whose scores on the entrance test fell below the cut-off point were enrolled in the program.) The requirement to enter the full General Studies program applies primarily to students who enroll in Arts and Sciences programs. Students enrolled in business and technical courses are not required to take General Studies 2.

A course in orientation to college designated General Studies 1 previously had been a part of the General Studies program but was not offered during 1967-68. To replace it an information packet was developed by the college and was mailed to all students.

Faculty staffing of the program is, as described by the president, on a "semi-volunteer" basis. Some evaluative work on the program has been initiated by the part-time coordinator. However, although the administration feels that the program should be continued on an experimental basis, there is a considerable difference of opinion about the effectiveness of a block program. There is general agreement that if the program is to be continued it must be more adequately supported and financed.

San Francisco City College

San Francisco City College, an urban college, is very near the geographical center of the city, and easily accessible by public or private transportation. Estimates by the faculty and administration at San Francisco City College put the percentage of the student body considered to be disadvantaged at somewhere between ten and twenty-five percent. In terms of the size of the college, this represents between 1,100 and 2,750 students. It is also felt at the college that the disadvantaged students are primarily black. However, San Francisco City College is relatively unique in the diversity of the racial background of its students. Black students are estimated to comprise eight to twelve percent of the student body, perhaps 1,100 students. Oriental students comprise somewhere between sixteen and twenty-eight percent. The black students have a Black Students' Association, with about 100 members. In addition , there is a Chinese Student Association, a Filipino-American club, and an Arab student group in the process of organization.

San Francisco City College maintains working contact directly with at least two important community agencies serving disadvantaged youth. These agencies, Youth for Service and the Mission Rebels, help identify disadvantaged young people for college experiences and help them get started at college. Both agencies get some of their support from federal anti-poverty funds. A third group in this category is the Arribas Juntas, which seeks to serve the Mexican-American community. However, this group is just getting started, and its efforts are on a smaller scale than are those of the other two agencies.

Important as these agencies are, however, it must be pointed out that the actual numbers of students identified for and served by the college through their efforts are not large in terms of the size of the college or the numbers of disadvantaged young people in a city like San Francisco. Approximately 26 students are at the college this summer through the efforts of Youth for Service, and somewhat fewer were in the regular term last year.

San Francisco City College uses its summer programs as a distinct means of encouraging high school students to attend college after graduation. During the summer of 1967, 232 high school students took one or more occupational courses, together with a two-unit course in psychology focused on career selection. College credit was given for these courses, which will be offered again during the summer of 1968. Another feature of the summer program for 1968 is the offering of a course in ornamental horticulture to approximately 100 disadvantaged unemployed high school drop-outs, who also spend part of their time working on a local horticulture beautification project. Wages are paid for this work from a Neighborhood Youth Corps grant.

A New Careers program was established in April, 1968. During the spring semester about 35 adult students were enrolled.

During the regular academic year, the instructional offerings which are the most significant in terms of the needs and aspirations of the disadvantaged are a series of courses focused on Afro-American culture. These courses can now lead to an Associate of Arts degree in this area. Also being developed is a Chinese curriculum, although there is yet no A.A. major available. The college also has six separate courses in English as a second language.

Approximately 50 members of the honor society are willing to provide tutoring services. However, the student personnel staff feels that this service is not as useful as it might be for disadvantaged students since most of the student tutors charge for their service. It was reported that an attempt is now being made by the Associated Students to subsidize some of the costs of tutoring. The Black Students Association provides some tutoring for their own members.

Liaison with the high schools is provided by counselors who visit the schools two or three times each semester. Students are assisted with their college programs.

In terms of the students' financial needs, the student personnel staff feels that many students experience problems resulting from the lack of money and that one of these problems is the emotional involvement associated with poverty. A federal Work-Study program is available, but the use of this by disadvantaged students is hampered by the twelve-unit academic requirement.

Santa Ana College

Santa Ana College is a small city college which serves the city of Santa Ana and the surrounding suburban area. Estimates by the college put the number of disadvantaged students between 700 and 1400. Orange County, in which Santa Ana College is located, has a sizeable Mexican-American population, and faculty and administrators at the college feel that there are large numbers of disadvantaged young people in the community not coming to college.

Santa Ana College offers a group of courses known as the General Studies program. This is not designed to serve only the disadvantaged, and the college has made an effort to avoid any labeling of the program. One of the members of the administration indicated that because of this, some of the students may not even know they are in special classes. The program is essentially an effort toward providing a flexible, individualized group of general education courses which are not remedial, but in which an academically weak student has a reasonable chance of success. It is considered a place for these students to begin, prior to identifying the student with any particular curriculum.

There is no required set of courses. The program offerings available to students include a two-semester sequence in communications, two semesters of a reading laboratory, three history courses, three courses in science, a sociology course, and a special section of the psychology course required of all beginning students at the college. A student is not directed into any block of courses, but rather selects courses on an individual basis when planning his program with a counselor. If a student has scored below the 35th percentile on the verbal part of the School and College Ability Test, the counselor makes a special effort to communicate the value of these courses. Estimates of numbers of students involved in one or more of the General Studies courses were 180 for the fall of 1967 and 83 for the spring of 1968, with approximately one-quarter of these Mexican-American, another quarter Negro, and the rest Caucasian.

Eight instructors teach the General Studies courses, and these instructors meet regularly to discuss the progress and problems of the students in the program. An attempt is made to employ staff who are interested in this kind of teaching, as well as in teaching more academically demanding courses. No one is required to teach General Studies classes if he does not wish to. Class size is usually about 20 students.

As of March 1968, no detailed evaluation had been made of the effectiveness of the program, but the college indicated that retention of low ability students had increased. One instructor indicated that one of the problems was a lack of satisfactory text books, since a specific effort is made to teach these courses at a post high-school level.

Other than the counselors' regular visits to the feeder high schools, there is no active recruiting, although there is interest in getting this started. Virtually no help is received from the high schools in identifying entering students who are disadvantaged.

Modesto Junior College

Modesto Junior College is a small city college with a total enrollment of approximately 80,000 of which, it was reported, between 11 and 20 percent were disadvantaged students.

The college operates an active program of continuing education. In the past the New Hope Project, which has been widely reported, was conducted until federal financing was withdrawn. During the summer of 1968 the SERA (Students for Education--Rural Areas) Project was initiated. Four staff members worked in the predominantly Mexican-American Communities to inform youth and adults about the educational opportunities within the Yosemite Junior College District which includes Modesto College and Columbia College. The administrators of the continuing education program are convinced that the junior college cannot afford to wait for disadvantaged students to enroll.

Many disadvantaged families have little or no background in or motivation for education beyond secondary school. To change that situation, say the administrators, it is necessary to take the college out into the community. This is done very effectively.

The Yosemite Junior College District includes a large sparsely populated area. To make junior college education available to students who live in that area the District operates an extensive, and expensive, transportation program.

Two years ago, Modesto Junior College cooperated with the local Community Action Program and conducted a limited summer Upward Bound type program. The students enrolled in the program were paid forty dollars per week and were enrolled in three college courses. The program was judged to be successful but it has not been repeated.

The reading program at the college deserves special mention. Although it was not designed specifically for disadvantaged students, many enroll in the program. The success of the program can be attributed to the dedication and enthusiasm of the staff. At the request of the staff, the program is voluntary. The staff is convinced that much less would be accomplished if students were required to enroll in the program on the basis of test scores. Each semester more students desire to enroll in the program than can be accommodated in the facilities.

Merritt College

Merritt College is one of the two community colleges of the Peralta Junior College District which serves the six cities of northern Alameda County. The college has a day enrollment of 6,500 and offers a broadly comprehensive program. Within the past five years the Negro student population of the college has grown from 8 percent to 30 percent. The college is located at the edge of one of the large ghetto areas of Oakland. It is estimated that the college enrolls a larger number of highly disadvantaged students than any other California community college.

Merritt College was the first community college to offer a full program of Afro-American studies leading to the Associate in Arts degree. Although the college planned for some time to establish this program, student demands unquestionably hastened the process. It is possible not only to major in Afro-American Studies but also to take a split major with approximately one-half of the course work in behavioral science, social science, creative arts, language arts or humanities. Many of the courses are taught by black instructors and the college is attempting to increase the number of such instructors in the program. Although the program was not designed for disadvantaged students specifically, many such students have enrolled and it appears that the program is effective in increasing student achievement in general, in intensifying motivation, and in building and repairing damaged self-concepts. The program is not limited to black students.

For the past several years the college has experimented with a series of courses designed specifically for students with weak academic backgrounds, including disadvantaged students. The degree of faculty involvement and participation has been high. In general, course numbering has changed from unconventional to conventional, credit value has changed from no credit to at least partial credit, and program organization has changed rigid prescription to greater flexibility. During the 1967-68 academic year the following subjects were offered: Man and His Living Environment, Basic Office Machine Skills, Basic Arithmetic, Problem Solving in College, Family Finance, Written Communication, The Young Adult in Society, and Speech. None of the courses are required but students who score below the 5th percentile on the School and College Ability Test are encouraged to begin with some of the special courses, especially Written Communication. Of course, the college also offers the usual remedial level courses in many academic areas.

Other course offerings which serve significant numbers of disadvantaged students as well as non-disadvantaged students are elective courses in Study Skills, Personal Development, Interpersonal Relations, and Career Planning. All of these courses are taught by counselors. It is reported that through these courses students are motivated to make greater use of the counseling services offered at the college.

The college operates two parent-participation nursery schools in connection with its Nursery School Assistant Training Program. The majority of mothers who participate are Negroes who live in poverty areas. The nursery school program is an effective link with the minority community.

Eighty-two unemployed heads of families, mostly Negroes are enrolled in the college's New Careers Program. The students work in community agencies for one-half time and spend one-half time in special classes at the college. The program is designed to open ladders to future job mobility.

The college has worked actively in both Oakland and Berkeley in the training of teacher aides for poverty area schools. Some of the courses in this program are taught by college instructors in the community schools.

The college operates an on-campus and an off-campus work study program but as is the case in other junior colleges which enroll a significant number of disadvantaged students, the program suffers from a chronic shortage of funds.

The Inner City Project of the Peralta Junior College District which is operated through Merritt College and Laney College is an interesting example of how a community college can move out into the community if special funding is available. The project is operated under a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity and the American Association of Junior Colleges.

There are three elements in the project at each of the colleges. (1) Two community centers will be constructed or rented in the poverty areas of Oakland. Although it is assumed that such centers will provide both formal and informal counseling, instruction, tutoring and various community services, the actual program will be established and directed by an advisory committee composed of a majority of residents of the poverty area. The personnel selection committee is similarly constituted. (2) The Student Service Corps is composed of disadvantaged students from the poverty areas who will enroll in one of the colleges. The students will enroll in some regular offerings and also in a special training program. They will work on a part-time basis with non-profit community organizations in the poverty areas. The goal of the program is to provide training for community leadership and to assist the non-profit community agencies to be more effective. (3) Thirty students will be given subsistence grants while enrolled in college. No part-time work will be required. The students must be disadvantaged students from the poverty area. The Advisory Committee will assist the selection of the students.

The Inner City Project is a pilot program. It is hoped that the funding for the project will be continued. Inner City Projects are also being conducted in several major cities in the United States. The programs differ considerably since they reflect local needs.

Laney College

Laney College is one of the colleges of the Peralta Junior College District. It has an enrollment of approximately 4,000 day students of which about 25 percent are black. During the past five years the college has changed from one which offered vocational courses almost exclusively to a comprehensive community college.

Rather than establish a special program for disadvantaged students, Laney College has sought to change the existing curriculum and educational practices to better meet the needs of disadvantaged students. For example, instead of establishing a separate course in Negro History, the existing equivalent course in American History is being changed to include the history of black people in the United States. Similar changes are being made in other subjects. Such changes, it is claimed, will make academic study more relevant and meaningful to disadvantaged black students. In the area of educational practice, a regulation now makes it possible for a student to elect to take a "W" (withdrawal) from a course at any time up to and through the final examination. Thus, disadvantaged students may enroll in the regular college program without fear of failure. The student who elects to take a "W" is permitted to repeat the course. Most of such changes resulted from the formation of a student-faculty-administrator Inter-Racial Affairs Committee. The committee has also initiated studies concerning course requirements, racial balance in various classes, ability level tracking, and the use of test scores. The committee has stimulated action and assisted in the problem of recruiting minority group instructors and administrators. The committee discovered that minority group and disadvantaged students were not seeking assistance from the counseling staff. Two student counselor-aides were employed to give direct assistance to such students and also to provide a link between the students and the counselors.

Many community colleges are now developing an Afro-American Studies program. At Laney College, in addition to modifying the regular program in the manner explained above, a program of African Studies is being developed. Two instructors from Africa have been employed to teach in the program and also in the regular program. Swahili is offered in the African Studies program.

The Department of Business has organized the Laney Student Enterprises, a corporation, which will engage in various commercial and business ventures. The corporation has received a large grant from the FACE Foundation. One of its first projects involves Dots for Lots--the placing of markers on parking lots. Disadvantaged students are given first choice of the jobs developed in the various projects. Several other innovative projects are planned for 1968-69.

One of the most urgent needs is for understanding and reconciliation between all ethnic groups. During 1967-68, Laney College conducted two weekend retreats for black and white students and instructors. These retreats have led to a new spirit of understanding and cooperation and they will be continued during 1968-69.

At the end of the 1967-68 academic year the Laney College Faculty Senate voted overwhelmingly to ask each instructor in the college to contribute two dollars per month to a loan fund to assist disadvantaged students to buy books and supplies. If all faculty members contribute, approximately $3,000 per year would be available for this purpose.

The Community Services Office has been established to assist disadvantaged and minority students at the college. The Office acts as an ombudsman on the campus. Instead of making numerous visits to various offices at the college, students are encouraged to bring their problems directly to the Community Services Offices. The Community Services Office also performs a liaison function with the community. Groups in the community which would like to offer a specialized course are given assistance in organizing the course and in obtaining a credential for the instructor they have chosen. The college operates the course as an ungraded or graded offering.

During 1967-68, the Community Services Office worked directly with the owner of a large apartment complex located at the edge of a ghetto area. The owner was experiencing difficulty with vandalism and generally unsightly or even unsanitary conditions. An apartment was assigned to the college and for some time the student body president, a black student, lived in the complex. The college offered several courses including Health, Child Care, and Consumer Education, at the apartment complex. In addition, cultural and recreational events were scheduled for the residents. Several field trips were conducted for the children. The program was an unqualified success and will be repeated during 1968-69.

The Community Services Office also established a "quick loan" program for disadvantaged students. A loan of twenty-five dollars could be given to a student by any one of the faculty or administrators working in the Office. The funds were obtained from various sources including The Peralta Federation of Teachers, The Associated Students, the Inter-Denominational Ministerial Alliance, and the Alamo Black Clergy.

The President of the College has established a broadly representative student advisory group which meets with him on a regular basis. This group is very much concerned with the problems of the minority and disadvantaged students at the college.

It has been stated previously that Laney College participates in the Inner City Project of the Peralta Junior College District.

Laney College provides an interesting example of how a college may seek to make changes in the existing program and in various educational policies and practices which will make college more meaningful and relevant for disadvantaged and minority students and will also motivate and assist such studentsto raise their achievement levels.

Sacramento City College

Sacramento City College, one of the two colleges within the Los Rios Junior College District is located in an urban area. The total enrollment is approximately 8,000. Although statistical data were not available, it appears that a very significant number of disadvantaged students who reside in the attendance area are not in the college. To meet this problem the college obtained a National Defense Education Act grant for the purpose of experimenting with a summer program during 1967 designed to recruit disadvantaged students for a period of orientation and counseling conducted by counselors. Recruiting was handled through the usual sequence of visits to feeder high schools and through writing letters to the students. Although no statistics were available regarding the evaluation of the program, it was thought to be sufficiently successful to repeat that program during the summer of 1968. The goal was to enroll 300 to 400 students who might not otherwise enroll in college. The program differs from some other summer programs in that it concentrates on the changing of attitudes toward college attendance through orientation and counseling. The changing of student attitudes toward college attendance is thought to be more important than skill improvement through the usual remedial courses. It is hoped that research will be conducted to evaluate the success of this promising approach.

The college conducts a program of remedial English courses called Workshop and Laboratory in Basic Writing Skills. The program was not established for disadvantaged students exclusively but undoubtedly many such students are enrolled. Extensive use is made of student tutors. Although the facilities are crowded and ill-equipped, (the instructor's office is the tutoring laboratory) the students appeared to be genuinely interested and even enthusiastic. The classroom and the laboratory were "alive" -- an atmosphere not usually found in remedial English classes. Again, the viability of the program was directly related to the dedication of the instructor. The program is still experimental and no evaluative research was available. However, the program appears to be much sought after by students. The classroom is filled to overflowing with tablet-arm chairs and there is a waiting list of students. Such programs should receive the support and encouragement of the faculty and administration.

The college also operates a very functional resource center which is manned by both student tutors, most of whom are employed under the federal Work-Study Program, and 24 faculty members from many departments who have volunteered some of their office hour time for this purpose. The resource center is used by all students but would appear to be especially useful to disadvantaged students who frequently need individual help since they are often reluctant to participate in class discussions and to ask questions of the instructor during the class period.

As was found in many colleges, several uncoordinated activities appeared to be underway. There is need at all colleges which serve significant numbers of disadvantaged students for greater concentration on the particular needs of disadvantaged students and for a staff member to coordinate all efforts being undertaken.

American River College

American River College, one of the colleges of the Los Rios Junior College District, is a suburan college with a total enrollment of approximately 9,000. It was reported that a very small proportion of the students were disadvantaged. However, within the general attendance area of the college there is one large high school which enrolls a significant number of minority and disadvantaged students. The College, it was said, did not draw well from that high school. No recruitment program has been undertaken.

The Threshold Program at American River College was not specifically designed for disadvantaged students, but almost certainty serves a number of such students. The program consists of a required block of courses including Reading Skills, Reading Development, Psychology A, which is an orientation-type course, and a selected list of electives. Each Psychology instructor is also a half-time counselor. The Psychology A course is taught by a Psychology instructor who is also the counselor for the students in his section of the course. This combination, it is reported, enables the instructor-counselor to have a greater exposure to his counselees which facilitates establishing rapport and communication between the counselor and the counselee.

No research has been conducted to determine the validity of the entrance criteria.

It was reported that approximately 175 students out of a total enrollment of about 5000 were enrolled in the program. More students would be enrolled if more instructors were available to work in the program.

The counselors teaching Psychology A in the program meet approximately 10 times per year for planning and evaluation and it was felt that such meetings were valuable.

In response to a question about whether students resented being enrolled in a remedial type program, it was stated that sometimes students from higher social classes did resent it but that the majority of the students seemed to appreciate the efforts being made for them. An attempt is made to insure that students experience some success. For example, the students earn a "C" during the first grading period if work habits and attendance are good--even if their work is below average. Efforts are made to minimize class competition. During each grading period the student receives a personal note from the counselor. The instructors attempt to build esprit de corps by a number of means including discussing frankly with the students the experimental nature of the program, its format, and its goals.

The program has been coordinated by a counselor since 1961 and much of its success must be attributed to her dedication. Since that time several instructor-counselors have been employed specifically to work in the Threshold Program. Although it appeared that little formal evaluation of the program has been conducted, an informal survey completed in 1965 indicated that students in the Threshold Program did persist in college longer than students who "qualified" for the program but entered regular classes instead. There was some indication that a more formal evaluation was to be undertaken and that the program would be the object of a joint faculty and administration study in the near future.

In the area of financial assistance, American River College has a well-developed scholarship, loan, and work-study program. The success of the program must be attributed to an aggressive, full-time financial aids officer. Unfortunately, the college enrolled very few disadvantaged students. The financial aids officer estimated that he could identify only about five such students who were receiving aid through his office. Throughout this present study there appeared to be a direct relationship between the amount of loan, scholarship, and work-study funds and the presence at the college of a full-time financial aids officer.

Los Angeles City College

Los Angeles City College is near the center of the city, and is a large comprehensive college with a total enrollment, including part-time and evening students, of about 18,000. The college estimates that between 20 and 30 percent of the student body are socio-economically disadvantaged, and that of this disadvantaged group the black students comprise the majority.

A semester-long block of courses, known as the Developmental Studies Program, is required of most of the beginning students who score below the tenth percentile on the School and College Ability Test, with exceptions made for foreign students. Because of the test score criterion, the program is actually for the educationally disadvantaged, regardless of economic standing, as is the case in all of the block-type programs in California junior colleges. However, because of the numbers served by this particular program, and from the personal knowledge of the students by the faculty involved, it is clear that the program does serve a significant number of socio-economically disadvantaged students.

The block of required classes include special basic courses in reading, speech, and psychology, totaling nine units. If he wishes, a student is permitted to take one additional course, chosen from a restricted list of electives. Enrollment in the program during the fall semester is about 400, with between 200 and 300 in the spring. Very closely related to the course work is another aspect of the Development Studies Program, which is optional but available tutoring. This service was used in the fall of 1967 by approximately 150 of the 360 students then in the program. At that time there were 13 tutors conducting the tutoring primarily in groups of five to ten students, but in some cases on a one-to-one basis. The specific goals of the tutoring program grow out of the aims of the course in reading, and are to help the student learn to read, to abstract, and to gather facts. Many of the tutors are minority group members and some are students who themselves have previously been in the Developmental Studies Program. A few are paid, with others getting a unit of college credit in connection with a course in education. At the college a comment was made that if tutors are not paid, some of the students needing tutoring feel that they should not ask for tutors' times. The classrooms, the tutoring rooms and the offices of the faculty members teaching in the program are all in the same building--making for a feeling of unity among all those involved.

A few points about the methods of the faculty members working in this program are worth noting. There is an awareness of the need for the program students to develop a sense of personal worth, and be help achieve this, the faculty attempt to get to know each student individually. It is also felt that the most important academic aspect of the program is learning to read adequately, and that emphasis should be on techniques to achieve this rather than on the reasons this is important. Class work is graded and returned immediately while the student still has the assignment clearly in mind. It is apparent that the faculty members involved in the Developmental Studies Program believe in it very much and are thoroughly dedicated to it. This, too, is an important part of the program.

Los Angeles Trade Technical College

Los Angeles Trade Technical College is located in the heart of the Los Angeles area and offers an extensive vocational program and a somewhat more limited program of liberal arts. It was estimated at the college that approximately 40 percent of the students were from minority groups and that approximately 15 percent of the student body would be classified as disadvantaged according to the definition used in the present study. As a result of the visit to the college, it appeared that the percentage of disadvantaged students might be somewhat higher.

The college conducts two special programs which are of interest. Neither program was especially designed for disadvantaged students but each probably enrolls significant numbers of such students. The special offering in the vocational area which is called the "Assistant" Program appeared to be more highly developed and will be discussed first.

The college conducts an extensive testing program through which students are admitted to vocational classes in the various areas. The cut-off scores appear to be rigidly applied. It is at least probable that some disadvantaged students might be prevented by the testing program from entering vocational programs in which they might succeed. The college has, however, designed a program for students who do not score above the required cut-off point but who do appear to have a reasonable chance for success. The Assistant Program was established on an experimental basis during the fall of 1964. Since that time the program has been added to about a dozen different vocational areas but apparently is not offered in all areas each semester. Two Assistant programs were observed--Art Production Assistant and Electronics Assistant Program. These programs are vocationally-based, but the skills taught are at a lower level than those taught in the regular vocational program. Along with the vocational training, students enroll in remedial courses. Thus, the Assistant Program has a double purpose--it provides basic vocational training which could lead to employment and also provides remedial education. An interesting aspect of the program is that the vocational skill training in the area of the student's choice is likely to provide motivation for the student in the remedial courses.

If the student succeeds in the Assistant Program, he is permitted to enroll in the regular vocational program. If he does not succeed, the student usually leaves the college to find employment. In that case, it is hoped that the Assistant Program was intrinsically valuable in terms of employable skills. The college reported, however, that difficulty was experienced in placing students in jobs after completing only the Assistant Program.

The instructors who were interviewed were enthusiastic about the program. One of the instructors estimated that approximately 40 percent of the students who enrolled in the Electronics Assistant Program were able to progress into the regular program after one semester. Research on the success of the Assistant Program was not available.

The other program in the liberal arts area is called the College Basic Skills Program (CBS). It has been previously pointed out that the program was designed for educationally disadvantaged students but that a significant number of the students in the program were unquestionably socio-economically disadvantaged. There are several sections of students in the program and each section is assigned for a major part of the day to one instructor. That is, each instructor teaches three or four of the courses included in the block program to the section for which he accepts major responsibility. The goal of the program is to take the educationally disadvantaged students where they are and to make it possible for them to make "meaningful progress." The instructors in the College Basic Skills Program did not feel that the only criterion of success was entrance into the regular college program and they recognized that not all students would or could benefit from the instruction.

The program is conducted in a three-classroom complex in which one of the rooms is called the CBS Programmed Systems Laboratory. This learning laboratory may be used for independent study or for individualized or small group instruction. Since each instructor spends several periods each day with one section, it is claimed that it is possible for the instructors, through longer periods of observation, to diagnose individual student learning difficulties and to prescribe specific remedial measures. Also, the longer periods of time each instructor spends with a section makes possible the maximum use of flexible scheduling which, in turn, facilitates the most efficient use of the multi-media laboratory.

The program is still experimental but the enthusiasm and dedication of the instructors and the obviously positive reaction of the students seem to indicate that the College Basic Skills Program holds promise as a compensatory approach in the education of disadvantaged students.

Of the students enrolled in the CBS program during the fall semester of 1966, 87 percent completed the semester and 81 percent enrolled in the spring semester. Eighty-five percent of those students who reenrolled completed the spring semester and 40 percent earned a grade point average of 2.0 or better.

East Los Angeles City College

East Los Angeles City College is located in an area of the city in which a significant proportion of the population is Mexican-American. The college estimates that perhaps six percent of its enrollment of approximately 13,000 students can be considered disadvantaged by the definition used in the present study.

The college has an impressive list of 160 separate scholarships awarded per semester, averaging $100 each.

Many of these are given on the basis of need and it is clear from the list of recipients for the spring of 1967, that most go to Mexican-American students. Approximately 100 students, most of whom are Mexican-American, are involved in Work-Study programs. Economic Opportunity Grants in the amount of about $17,000 per year are made available to students.

In the instructional program, the cultural heritage of the Mexican-American occupies a significant place in a course in the History of the Americas. The course is popular with all groups of students. The college is now developing a course in Spanish which will emphasize the values of Latin-American culture. Also being developed is a course in public speaking for Mexican-American students. Both of these courses will be taught in Spanish. Since many Mexican-American students have difficulty with English pronunciation, phraseology, and idiomatic expression, a special speech course is being developed for such students with foreign language backgrounds.

The college submitted a proposal under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which would provide for the identification and recruitment at the high school and for a special instructional program in the college for disadvantaged students who might otherwise not elect to enroll. A somewhat similar proposal was submitted under Title IV, Section 408, of the same Act.

In cooperation with the Office of Urban Affairs of the Los Angeles City Schools, the college prepared an application for funds to support an "Upward Bound" project. East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles City College, and Southwest College will offer Psychology 39, an orientation course, for adults enrolled in the Los Angeles New Careers program.

Los Angeles Southwest College

Los Angeles Southwest College, which opened in 1967, is the newest college in the Los Angeles system. It is located in the southwestern part of the city where a large proportion of the population is black. Although any student in the Los Angeles district may attend any of the district's junior colleges, the Los Angeles Southwest College probably reflects the community around it as approximately 90 percent of its students are black, with the balance divided almost evenly between white and Mexican-American students. In the spring of 1968, the enrollment was about 1,100 in the day program and 1,000 in the evening. Even though many of the students come from disadvantaged backgrounds, Los Angeles Southwest College does not emphasize remedial programs. It is felt that the reason students may lack academic skills is simply that they have not been adequately taught in the past and, therefore, heavy stress is placed on the quality of teaching at the college. However, for students with weak academic backgrounds, there is a series of courses available which are designed to supply concepts to which students may not have been exposed previously. These courses are in English, speech, science, social studies, psychology, humanities, and mathematics. They are taught as college-level preparatory courses rather than as a repetition of high school material.

Plans are being made for a "modular" type program to begin in the fall of 1968. Intensive six-week blocks of work in reading, mathematics, and logic will assist students with preparatory deficiencies to catch up in a relatively short time.

Diablo Valley College

Diablo Valley College is a suburban college serving a large "bedroom" community located near the urban centers of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay area. Its general attendance area also includes two small cities which have a Negro population of significant size from which the college has drawn a less than proportional number of students. This situation has always been a matter of some concern to the college.

During the spring semester of 1966 a program was initiated with the cooperation of the Vocational Rehabilitation Department. During that semester, 25 Negro students were recruited and enrolled in a prescribed list of courses, some of which were especially designed to meet particular needs and some of which were regular offerings of the college. The program consisted of:

Writing Workshop
Reading Workshop
Reading Development
Mathematics (remedial)
Health
Psychology (exploration of self concept and value system)
Psychology (independent study with counselor--study skills, etc.)
Elective

This block of courses was a one-semester program. Those students who succeeded were permitted to enter a second semester with a wider choice of electives. Those students who persisted into the third semester were permitted to enter the regular college program with few restrictions. Although no formal research about the success of students is available, it was reported to be sufficiently successful to warrant its continuance.

During each semester the instructors (all of whom had volunteered to teach in the program) met every two weeks for planning and evaluation. A Negro counselor who was on the campus two days per week was provided at no cost to the college by the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. This counselor, who maintained frequent contact with the students, was found to be an important element in the program. Regular college students who were enrolled in Field Work in Social Sciences received academic credit for assisting with the tutoring of the special students. Several tutors were employed under the Federal Work-Study Program.

The instructors and the counselors who worked in the special program reported that it was necessary to devote three to four times as much individual help to the special students as it was to regular students. Obviously, unless such essential additional individual instruction and counseling is provided voluntarily by teachers and counselors, it becomes an expensive component of a special program for disadvantaged students.

Since the instructors and counselors involved in the program recognized the disadvantages of a tightly-prescribed sequence of courses, it was decided that during the following year an attempt would be made to introduce more flexibility into the special students' choice of courses and instructors. Forty-seven special students were enrolled in a much wider selection of classes taught by 72 different instructors. During that semester it was found that the planning and evaluation, and the communication between instructors and students was severely diminished and the program was judged to be significantly less successful than it had been during the previous semester. After that experience it was decided that during the next year, the program should be organized according to the original restricted form. Evidently, staff communication, planning and evaluation, combined with massive amounts of individualized instruction and counseling were felt to be preferable and more effective than immediate flexibility of student choice of subject and instructor.

This apparently successful "block" program includes several important and noteworthy features:

1. Cooperative effort of counselors and instructors.
2. Especially modified courses for disadvantaged students.
3. Massive amounts of individualized instruction and counseling by instructors, counselors, and student tutors.
4. Continuous planning and evaluation by a team.

Diablo Valley College has also conducted special summer programs which involve the recruitment of disadvantaged students. Students were enrolled in two courses, a specially modified section of the communications course and a psychology course which consisted of independent work with a counselor. During the summer of 1967, forty-seven students were enrolled in the program. Thirty-six continued in college during the following semester. During the summer of 1968 the program was planned to enroll 50 students. Twenty student tutors will be involved in the program. Some of the tutors are enrolled in the college course, Field Work in Social Science, and some will be employed under the federal Work-Study program.

Although both the "block" program and the summer program are still in the experimental stage, the programs are judged by the college to hold great promise in terms of recruiting and retaining disadvantaged students and improving their academic performance.

Contra Costa College

Contra Costa College is located in an area of Contra Costa County which includes a sizeable Negro population. Between 20 and 30 percent of the student body of over 5,000 is considered by the college to be disadvantaged. It is also felt that there are many disadvantaged young people in the community who are not presently inclined to consider the possibility of college for themselves.

There are several ways in which this college seeks to serve the disadvantaged students on the campus and attempts to reach out into the community. For enrolled students, the college has an extensive work-study program with funding of approximately $70,000. The program provides an opportunity for any student who qualifies to be helped in this manner.

Another important service available to students is tutoring. During the 1967-68 year there were seventeen tutors, chosen on the basis of personal commitment to this kind of work as well as subject capability. Four of the tutors were black students, and two were Mexican-American. The tutoring is done in a building used exclusively for this purpose, and having facilities for one-to-one contacts as well as areas for larger group sessions. There is also a central place, staffed by a student secretary, for filling out tutoring request forms and arranging schedules. Each tutor is paid $1.75 per hour for fifteen hours a week, with twelve hours spent directly with students, two spent in preparation or in conference with the counselor who coordinates the program, and one hour spent in a meeting of all the tutors. These meetings are an important part of the program and are used in part for sensitivity training for the tutors. During the year, there were approximately 130 students using the tutoring service at any given time, and there were more students wanting this help than could be served.

In the area of recruiting and community contacts, Contra Costa College is planning to have, during 1968-69, a mobile counseling unit, which, it is felt, will be especially helpful to those in the community who are not presently college oriented. One of the primary goals of the project is the recruitment of disadvantaged students. The unit will contain informational materials, testing facilities, film strips, and places where people can sit down to talk. It will be staffed by a counselor with one or more aides who live in the disadvantaged neighborhoods and who are known to and trusted by the people in these neighborhoods.

Another important type of contact with the community is maintained by four or five members of the counseling staff, who voluntarily serve on such neighborhood groups as the Economic Opportunity Council and the Neighborhood House Board of Directors.

In order to coordinate effectively the various activities of the college in serving the disadvantaged both on and off the campus, Contra Costa College has established a Developmental Study Group, whose members include those with responsibilities in the various programs described above. This group meets twice a month, keeps minutes, employs consultants, and makes recommendations to the college administration.

College of San Mateo

The College of San Mateo is unique among California junior colleges in that it has a program specifically designed to recruit and serve students who are clearly disadvantaged, both from a socio-economic standpoint and from an educational standpoint. This effort, known as the College Readiness Program, was started in the summer of 1966 and grew out of the concern of the administration and some of the counseling staff that this large suburban college was inadequately serving the minority students in its district. With an enrollment of 16,000, the College of San Mateo has one of the most attractive campuses in the state, high on a hilltop and surrounded by expensive homes. Public transportation to the college from the ghetto area of East Palo Alto costs one dollar a day and takes more than an hour each way, making it very difficult for black students from the ghetto area to get to the college at all. Prior to the inception of the College Readiness Program, ninety percent of those who did get to the college from the ghetto withdrew voluntarily or because of poor grades.

Because of the image of the college as an upper middle class institution and because academically capable black young people are now being wooed by many colleges, the College of San Mateo deliberately decided to break away completely from the usual approaches and to insist that those recruited have all the qualities of high-risk students. Accordingly, they: were poor, were black, disliked school, had poor high school records and low test scores. Just prior to beginning the program, which started during the summer of 1966, recruiting was carried on at high schools, on street corners, in pool halls, and anywhere a prospect might be found. One kind of response from some of these young people was so characteristically common that it subsequently became the title of a now well-known published description of the program: "Me go to college? Man, You Must Be Kidding!" However, 39 started during the first summer. Of the 36 who finished the summer, 34 enrolled in the fall. All 56 who started during the summer of 1967 finished the summer and enrolled in the fall. It is planned for the summer of 1968 to include approximately 100 students and to expand the program to add a Mexican-American group. The College Readiness Program is by no means a summer-only effort, but the program during the academic year differs in some ways from that offered in the summer which will be described first.

For the six weeks summer period, students are picked up at their homes by a college bus at 7 a.m., spend all day on the campus, and are returned by bus to their homes by 6 p.m. Then, an hour later, they are picked up by their tutors and spend the evening in study sessions with one-to-one tutoring. During the day on campus, the students spend about four hours in classes and another three hours in paid employment through the Work-Study program. Lunches are provided free. The classwork involves a required guidance course including orientation to the college and library skills, an English class, and one regular university-transfer elective, which may be history or psychology or any other academically-demanding course.

The staff involved and the tutors are willing to go to almost any length to enable students to stay with their academic work. If a student fails to show up for the bus in the morning, it is not uncommon to knock on his door and even to get him out of bed. Bail money is occasionally provided. In one case the relationship developed between the college and the local probation officers which resulted in one offender being allowed to be picked up by his tutor at the jail in the morning, taken to college all day, and returned to the jail at 5 p.m. Then the tutor returned to the jail in the evening to work there with the student.

In addition to the individual tutoring help given the program students, another factor enhancing the effectiveness of the program is a large area used exclusively for this program and known as the College Readiness Center. Here meetings can be held, tutoring facilities are available, the staff offices are located, and coffee is made all day. All the student personnel services that are normally scattered around a campus are provided in this room and specifically geared to the special needs of disadvantaged black students new to the college. Financial aid, job placements, transportation problems, dealing with white middle-class academic standards--all these require not only special individual attention but a place in which to provide this attention, which is the College Readiness Center.

During the academic year, more students are involved than during the summer, but some of the students are those continuing because of their initial summer experience. The special guidance class is not given during the year, and these highly disadvantaged students are permitted to try whatever regular courses they wish, subject only to the prerequisites applicable to all students. Approximately 180 were active in the College Readiness Program in the fall of 1967, and 244 started in the spring of 1968. It is estimated by the college that during the two academic years and the two summers that the program has been in operation from 400 to 600 students have been involved. A student service group called the New Black Generation has been formed by the students in the program. To be eligible to hold an office in this group, a student does not have to have a specified grade average.

Strong reliance is placed on the tutors, not only to provide the necessary massive one-to-one tutoring which undergirds the whole program, but also to help in making many important decisions about the program and the students in it. During the summer all tutors in this program are paid for a 40-hour week. During the year some tutors work on a volunteer basis and some are paid for a 15-hour week. A substantial effort is made to develop an esprit de corps among the tutors, not only through their feeling of being of direct service, but also through such activities as a five-day retreat last summer for sixty tutors at a camp in the Napa Valley, dinners given by staff members, and special concert trips. Channeling the energies of bright but sometimes discontented activists into productive activity through giving tutoring service has also been a substantially successful effort. Sometimes a C-average black tutor will himself receive tutoring, in order to permit him to compete for a scholarship or to apply for admission to a four-year college. A very significant point made at the college is that since there are not enough black tutors, eventually every black student in the program has a close personal white friend.

There are certain educational positions taken by the staff of the College Readiness Program and supported by the administration and the Board of Trustees that are worth noting. It must also be pointed out that these positions do not always go unchallenged at the college or by educators elsewhere. First, the College Readiness Center is set up as a place for black students. It is strongly felt that one of the things that these disadvantaged black students need is a "home-base" in which they can find security and around which they can develop a sense of pride in themselves and their background as well as to begin to find some success in an academic setting. It is felt that being economically or educationally disadvantaged is not as much of a barrier to academic success as is being from a black ghetto background, and that the development of self-confidence and self-pride are highly important. Given the backgrounds from which the program students come, it is felt that they are much less likely to be able to take meaningful part in heterogeneous classes if they do not have at least some initial psychological support provided by the College Readiness Center. Recognizing that this is also true for disadvantaged Mexican-American students, the college is now moving to provide this same type of home-base security for this new group, which is planned for the fall of 1968.

A second position relates to permitting these previously ill-equipped students to attempt university-transfer courses immediately if they desire to, and many do so desire. The basis of this position is that all too frequently during previous education, these students have been put into remedial or special classes, and that now the opportunity for first class academic citizenship ought to be provided. Were it not for the massive tutoring, this would not be successful. However, combined with the tutoring, it is felt that the pride in being able to take the regular classes, and the motivation engendered by this is the significant factor in the academic success of many of these students. The drop-out rate has changed from the previous figure of 90 percent to 40 percent. By now, it is clear from experience and from a recent study made at the college that there are also many students who do not achieve academic success, and some modifications to the program are contemplated. However, these are relatively minor and the staff involved as well as the college administration firmly believe in the basic approach used. Further, it is felt that academic success of the students is not the only criterion which should be used to judge the worth of a program like this, and that even if a severely disadvantaged student can make only very low grades, his exposure to college has helped a great deal in learning to articulate and that his chances of securing employment are thus much enhanced. It is also felt that the profound involvement most of these students have in the College Readiness Program has given them something of considerable personal importance, regardless of academic success.

The program staff do not feel that students should continue in the program under all conditions. Students are continously evaluated by the staff, not on the basis of grades, but on class attendance, time spent studying, and whether or not they keep their tutoring appointments. Occasionally, it is deemed best that a student not continue at the college.

It is quite obvious that the staff devoted a great deal of extra time and some of their own money. It is equally obvious that the students, virtually without exception, are fiercely loyal and grateful to the staff.

Mira Costa College

Mira Costa College, serving the Oceanside-Carlsbad area of southern California, has about 1,000 day students and another 1,000 in the evening. Estimates made at the college of the number of these students who should be considered disadvantaged were from ten to thirty percent, with the ethnic composition of this group including Caucasians, Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and some Samoans. Demographic data obtained three years ago indicated that approximately 25 percent of the families in the Oceanside-Carlsbad area are impoverished. The Negro and Mexican-American students graduating from the Oceanside high school are not attending Mira Costa College in very large numbers, and there are plans now being made to focus more attention on recruiting.

Two specific efforts are made at Mira Costa College to serve the on-campus student who is academically weak. Many of these students are also socio-economically disadvantaged. The first of these efforts is a special academic track program to make it easier for the students during their first year. This program, which the college has avoided giving a label, consists of a five-unit basic course in political science, a similar course in United States history, and a three-unit course in applied psychology which includes a battery of tests and a term project in which the student evaluates himself and his plans. Enrollment in these special track courses is not required, but students with low academic aptitude test scores are encouraged to take advantage of these courses, which can be used to satisfy requirements for graduation. During the spring of 1968, there were approximately 200 students in one or more of the special track courses. Many of the students in this program are vocational-terminal students also taking work in their major fields.

In addition to this, the college has developed a set of courses in reading and places considerable value on the effects these reading courses are having on academically weak students. For those needing the most basic remedial work, there are two sequential five-unit semester courses. For those who are a bit stronger, two courses are also offered, each for two units. Out of a total faculty of only 38, two instructors devote all their time to this reading program, and are well trained and deeply committed to the value of this work. A special reading laboratory has been set up, and the classes are taught in conjunction with this laboratory which contains some special equipment. More important, the approach is very informal and flexible with much individual work. Students are graded simply on their own progress. After some diagnostic testing, the instructors usually start a student at a reading level two years below where the tests indicate that student might be, to allow for immediate success rather than to face the student with academic tasks which may appear to him so overwhelming that he may tend to give up. In the spring of 1968, approximately 100 students were in the most basic reading course, and 75 in the next course. Class sizes were set at not more than 25. Formal evaluation of the effects of this reading program has not been made, but everyone involved feels that the program has had a substantial effect on the retention of students at the college.

Pasadena City College

Pasadena City College enrolls about 13,500 students, of which between ten and twenty percent are estimated by the college to be socio-economically disadvantaged. Most of these are Negro students although there is also a Mexican-American group.

Services offered by the college of benefit to disadvantaged students cover a varied range. During the summer of 1967, there was a special program designed especially to help high school students from impoverished families. The objective of this program, called Project College Bound, was to encourage these students to attend college during the year and to make them realize that they could do the academic work. An important part of this project in attracting students was the opportunity to earn money during the summer and this was made possible in part by the college budget but largely through funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Students in the project were paid $1.40 per hour for up to six hours a day, and this included class time as well as time spent in employment in various community agencies for ten weeks. Students could earn as much as $420 during the summer. That amount of money represents a real inducement to attend college. One of the regular faculty members was in charge of this project, and he selected students for the project through personal interviews, taking into account both financial need and potential for college work. Thirty-six students participated, working two hours each day, and taking a maximum of four hours of class work per day. The students were permitted to take any courses for which they met the prerequisites, and the instructor involved extended a great deal of individual help to each student.

In the same area of financial assistance to needy students through job placements, it is worth noting that the Pasadena City College Placement Center makes approximately 12,000 student referrals during an academic year. More than 200 of these are work-study placements.

During the academic year, four of the classes in reading techniques are reserved for students with acute reading problems, and the college feels that many of the students served in these classes are in the disadvantaged category.

Pasadena City College is one of the few junior colleges in California which has a large and well organized Tutorial Center. Directed by a full-time staff member, the Center occupies a pleasant room in which some programmed learning materials and other resources such as special dictionaries are located. The Center is open from 9 A.M. to 4 P.M. each day, including Christmas vacation and the period between semesters. During the fall semester of the 1967-68 year, there were 400 requests for tutoring, of which about 60 percent were served. There were 40 tutors, all volunteer, drawn from students at the college, from four-year colleges nearby and from the community. All were selected after an interview with the staff member directing the program, who is concerned with the motives and attitudes of the prospective tutors, as well as with tutoring competence. It was indicated that because of the demand, three times as many tutors could be used as are available. An attempt is made to obtain tutors who can serve as role models and also to obtain minority group students as tutors. About ten out of the forty are members of minority groups.

Pasadena City College, as well as several other junior college districts in California, offers an extensive evening program with classes both on the campus and at various places out in the community. Those offerings in the community are frequently directly designed for the needs of the disadvantaged, and are of considerable importance in extending educational help. However, as pointed out elsewhere in this report, classes in community centers primarily involve adults rather than college-age youth, whose educational opportunities are the specific concern of the present study.

During the interview with the president of the college, he stated that a college's commitment to equalize educational opportunity must be felt and implemented by all administrators, counselors, and instructors if that commitment is to result in effective measures. In addition to providing educational leadership geared to equalizing educational opportunity, the president himself makes frequent, informal contacts with minority group students. This is accomplished simply by approaching small groups of students anywhere on the campus and asking them about their college experiences. All administrators have been urged to make similar contacts. The students are encouraged to come to the president's office to discuss individual problems which they have not been able to resolve through the normal channels. The president has instructed his secretary to interrupt him in conferences or meetings if a minority student asks to see him. Frequently, it is necessary to make a later appointment but, at least, the student actually makes that appointment with the president himself.

Bakersfield College

Bakersfield College, with a student body of approximately 8,000, serves the city of Bakersfield as well as rural areas of Kern County. The college estimates that between ten and twenty percent of its students are socio-economically disadvantaged, and that of this group about one-half are Caucasian, with about equal numbers of Negroes and Mexican-Americans making up the balance.

For the past ten years, Bakersfield College has had a special program of classes designed to help those considered poor academic risks. Since its inception, this program has undergone some changes in content and name, and is now known as Program O. It presently consists of special classes in English and mathematics. Beginning students are given the School and College Ability Test, an English achievement test, and are required to write a short composition. If a student scores below the tenth percentile on the verbal section of the SCAT, and if his achievement in English is deemed inadequate by the Chairman of the English Department who reads all the compositions and checks the scores of the English achievement test, the student is required to take the basic one-semester English course. If the student scores below the eleventh percentile on the Quantitative section of the SCAT, he is required to take a one-semester basic mathematics course. Thus, he may be in either or both of these parts of Program O. In addition, all new students take a nine-week, one-half unit orientation class, and Program O students are in special sections of this class. Additional electives are permitted if the prerequisites do not preclude enrollment in them. The Basic Program O courses are open to other students who wish to elect them, but not many do. Until recently, a basic social science course was a part of the program but so many of the students lacked the basic reading skills essential for this course that it is not now offered.

The three instructors involved in the special English course are reading specialists and have this course as a permanent part of their work. Teaching is informal, with note-taking not emphasized, since this is difficult for these students, and with the final grading such that the students rarely fail. Frequent graded assignments are used instead of two or three major examinations in order to avoid putting too much academic pressure on the students at any one time. At the beginning of the semester, the class size is about 30, in the fall of 1967, there were 200 Program O students. It was indicated at the college that one of the problems with this program is the fact that there is nothing after the first semester for those students still needing substantial extra academic help.

There are three counselors who work with Program O students. Active recruiting of students who might not otherwise come to the college is limited to a special summer block program, known as Basic Skills 100. Students in this program get six units of credit for four hours of class work each day.

An interesting way in which Bakersfield College serves the disadvantaged community is through its nursery school program, operated by the Home Economics Department in a Negro neighborhood in South Bakersfield. As long as a child is in the nursery school, the department requires one or both parents or other adult responsible for the child to attend a parents' class given in the neighborhood. In 1967-68 there were two sections of this class involving a total of 40 adults and covering an age range from seventeen-year olds to grandparents. In addition to discussions of parent-child relationships, the Home Economics Department includes material on foods and clothing. When parents miss classes, one of the Home Economics instructors makes a home visit, and these personal contacts are felt to be important, not only in terms of help with problems the parents may be having, but also to open individual avenues of contact between the college faculty and the community. A few parents in these classes have been encouraged in this way to attend regular classes on the campus, and in other cases these contacts have led the parents to encourage their other older children to consider college.

Compton College

Compton College, in the south central area of greater Los Angeles, serves a district in which there are many minority group families. With a student body of about 5,000, the college estimates that between 40 and 50 percent of its students are disadvantaged, and that this group is predominantly black.

A few years ago, in an effort to help the many severely disadvantaged students, Compton College instituted a three-level system. Those students who score at or below the 10th percentile on both sections of the School and College Ability Test are placed in Level I and are on trial for the first semester. They are required to take a basic three-unit course in communications and may choose up to ten units more of additional courses from a list of electives which includes about ten introductory vocational courses and approximately 20 very elementary liberal arts courses. Students scoring between the eleventh and thirty-ninth percentile on the SCAT are placed in Level II. At this level, students are required to take between five and seven units of English in certain middle-level courses, with some choices in these courses available to the student. Unless a student's unit load is limited by his counselor, he may take additional units up to a maximum of fifteen and a half units from the regular vocational courses or from academic transfer courses for which he meets the prerequisites. Level III students are those scoring at or above the 40th percentile, and these students are allowed to take up to seventeen and a half units during the first semester.

The percentages of students falling into the various levels,of course,varies from semester to semester, but perhaps one-quarter of the beginning students are in Level I, one-half in Level II, and one-quarter in Level III. All courses are acceptable for credit toward the A.A. degree. Since the inception of the program, the college has noted an increase in its average daily attendance figures, and attributes this to increased holding power provided by the Level Program.

Contact with the local high schools is facilitated through the part-time employment of some high school counselors during the evenings. With its high ratio of minority students, the college actively tries to get minority faculty members, and during the 1967-68 year there were eight such out of a total faculty of 82. Even with the high percentage of minority students on the campus, the college feels that there are undoubtedly many in the community it serves who are not coming, and believes that lack of money and transportation problems are among the major reasons why these young people do not enroll in the college.

Summary

One of the objectives of the study was to identify effective programs for disadvantaged students. Practically all of the programs for such students in California junior colleges have been described. However, since little or no evaluative research has been conducted, it is impossible to make qualitative judgments about the relative effectiveness of the described programs. In fact, there does not even appear to be much agreement about program objectives or what the criteria of success should be. If effectiveness is measured in terms of the proportion of disadvantaged students who actually graduate with an Associate in Arts degree or who actually transfer to a four-year college, most of the programs which have been described must be evaluated as being only marginally effective. If, however, effectiveness is measured in terms of taking the disadvantaged student where he is and making it possible for him to experience some improvement in his achievement and to have some college experience, most of the programs could be rated as reasonably effective.

A complicating factor is that there is very little information about what proportion of a given group of disadvantaged students could reasonably be expected to succeed in a junior college program. Experience indicates that a large proportion of non-disadvantaged students do not graduate with an Associate in Arts degree and only a small proportion actually transfer to a four-year college. It is unlikely that larger proportions of disadvantaged students would graduate from two-year programs or transfer to four-year colleges. Also, since standardized tests are not very useful in the assessment of their college capability, it is difficult to establish expectation levels for disadvantaged students.

The almost total lack of evaluative research and the absence of criteria of effectiveness preclude the possibility of making a qualitative judgment about the relative effectiveness of the major approaches to providing equality of educational opportunity for disadvantaged students. For example, the success of a recruitment program can be measured in terms of the number of disadvantaged students who have enrolled in a college who would have otherwise not enrolled. However, unless there is some method of determining the total number of disadvantaged students of college age in the community who have not, and probably will not, enroll in college, no meaningful assessment of the effectiveness of that program is possible. Not one thorough community survey designed to determine how many disadvantaged students were not enrolled in a college was reported--even though there was general agreement that there were large numbers of such students.

It should be quite clear at this point that it is not possible to outline a model program which would be established at any junior college. The programs which appeared empirically to be more successful than others were those which had been designed specifically to meet the particular needs of the disadvantaged students in a given community. Thus, although the experience of other colleges should be studied in detail, each college planning to establish a program for the disadvantaged students in its community should begin with a community survey and a thorough study of the particular needs of the disadvantaged students in that community.

It is possible to identify the major types of programs which have been established to serve disadvantaged students. The most numerous type is a series or block of required remedial courses. The compulsory aspect and the degree of student choice varies considerably. In every case, however, enrollment in the remedial program is determined by a standardized test score. In general, the major objective of such programs is to give students an opportunity to increase their competence in communication and numerical skills. Usually, skills repair or refurbishment is engaged in for a dual purpose--to provide an intrinsically valuable college experience and to make it possible for the student to enter and succeed in the regular program. Several advantages of this type of program were reported.

1. It does not require additional funds since the students in the program would be enrolled in other courses if the program did not exist.
2. It facilitates the identification and counseling of disadvantaged students since they spend most of their time in a prescribed series of courses. Also, counselors usually establish contact with the students by teaching one of the required courses.
3. It makes it possible to identify a student's specific learning difficulties and to prescribe appropriate remedial techniques.
4. It provides a less competitive environment for students who might otherwise become discouraged by their aptitude and achievement relative to non-disadvantaged students.
5. It takes maximum advantage of the "Hawthorne Effect" and facilitates the establishment of esprit de corps.
6. It makes it possible to adopt unconventional grading standards and practices.
7. It provides maximum opportunity for flexible scheduling and the use of a learning laboratory.
8. Since a small number of dedicated instructors and counselors is involved, communication for the purposes of planning and evaluation is facilitated.
9. By removing under-prepared students from regular classes the maintenance of "college standards" is possible.

10. Methods and techniques which are found to be successful in the remedial program are frequently adopted by instructors of regular classes. The general level of instruction is thereby improved.

Several disadvantages were also reported.

1. Since so many of the disadvantaged students are also members of minority groups, special remedial programs sometimes appear to the students to be a form of de facto segregation.
2. Too many disadvantaged students have experienced the results of tracking in the elementary, junior high, and high schools. Frequently they come to the junior college conditioned to failure and with damaged self-concepts. Required attendance in yet another lower level remedial-type program reinforces such feelings and tends to inhibit rather than facilitate learning.
3. Disadvantaged students are prevented from establishing supportive peer group relationships with students of many ethnic groups in the regular program of the college. Unusual course numbering, the inapplicability of remedial course credits, and unfortunate designations of remedial programs all lead to a feeling of second class citizenship.
4. It is difficult to recruit dedicated and capable instructors for remedial programs. It is axiomatic that the first loyalty of an instructor is to his discipline. Involvement in a remedial program sometimes results in the serious questioning of the instructor's academic respectability.
5. The watering down of subject matter in remedial programs does not give a student an opportunity to confront the realities of college work.
6. Students in remedial programs are not given an opportunity to experience the stimulation of association with capable students and of participation in active class discussion. They see no "role models" who might motivate them and raise their level of aspiration.
7. Remedial courses are frequently dull and are perceived by students to be "more of the same."

It is worth repeating that almost all of the remedial programs which were observed in the colleges were established for low-ability students--as measured by test scores--rather than for disadvantaged students. If disadvantaged students are to be assisted by a required series of remedial courses, such courses should be designed to meet their specific needs. There is no reason to believe that disadvantaged students are low-ability students.

Another approach to providing educational opportunities for disadvantaged students is through the provision of special services including tutoring, additional counseling, free transportation, free lunches, legal assistance, special financial assistance, part-time employment, and a designated area which is a "home base." Sometimes the program includes recruiting, and a few programs include a special summer orientation program of study and part-time employment. A general characteristic of this type of program is that the disadvantaged students are normally enrolled in the regular college program. Several advantages of the supportive special services program were reported:

1. Many of the external barriers to college attendance and academic success are attacked directly. Thus, students are able to devote more time and energy to college work.
2. The student enters the mainstream of the college and is thereby motivated and stimulated.
3. Role models are easily found and assist the student to raise his aspiration level.
4. Tutoring has been found to be effective in raising achievement levels because it focuses upon specific individual learning difficulties.
5. A minority group member who is given an opportunity to tutor a student of his own ethnic group or a student from another minority or the majority group not only receives financial aid but also experiences a significant enhancement of his own status. At the same time, he becomes a role model for other students of his ethnic group.
6. Tutoring by members of the majority group creates an opportunity for them to become closely and personally involved with minority group members and to gain an understanding of the culture and special needs of the disadvantaged minority group student.

Several disadvantages of the special services approach were reported.

1. The program is expensive.
2. Even with the assistance provided by the special services, disadvantaged students frequently experience failure in the regular classes of the college, since those courses may appear to be irrevelant or may assume skills and competencies which have not yet been developed.
3. There is a problem of continuity since the tutors frequently move on to other colleges after a few semesters or quarters.
4. The "home base" usually provided may tend to perpetuate separatism.

It should be mentioned that most of the special services programs observed were specifically designed for disadvantaged students.

A third approach to equalizing educational opportunity for disadvantaged students is the most difficult to describe since it involves revising grading, probation, retention, disqualification, tracking, and other similar policies. Simplification of registration procedures and easing course prerequisites are also sometimes included. Although the revised policies and practices apply to all students, the motivation for change was derived from a desire to assist disadvantaged students. It goes without saying that the whole educational environment is often improved as a result of such revisions. The approach is largely invisible to students and it is possible that the invisibility is an asset since it avoids the labeling of students.

Some colleges which have sought to assist disadvantaged students through the strategies mentioned in the preceding paragraph have also made formal attempts to involve such students in the decision-making organization on the campus, to take the college out into the community, and to involve the community in the affairs of the college through special community service programs, courses, forums, and seminars.

None of the three major approaches exists as a pure type. Tutoring, especially, is widely used as a technique to assist students who have learning difficulties.

Several other components or strategies are also common to the three major approaches.

An increasing number of colleges have established programs of Afro-American, African, or Mexican-American studies in an attempt to make college work more relevant and meaningful for minority group disadvantaged students. Such programs appear to be useful and effective both from the point of view of increasing relevance as well as in terms of attracting disadvantaged students to the junior college.

There is also a growing recognition of the need for learning laboratories, staffed with specialists and equipped with technological aids to learning. These laboratories appear to be useful to disadvantaged students with specific learning difficulties. Independent study frequently permits such students to catch up faster than they would in the traditional remedial courses.

Finally, many junior colleges are actively seeking minority group administrators, instructors, and counselors. Some progress is being made but it appears that junior colleges often lure available minority group personnel from other colleges or from high school districts. The result of this piracy is that the total number of minority group personnel in the state as a whole is not increased as rapidly as it might be. There is a real need for the recruitment and training of personnel who might normally be considered under-qualified for a given position. The problem of obtaining credentials for such personnel is a serious stumbling block. For example, the racial and ethnic survey of California junior colleges for the fall of 1967 indicates that 94.3 percent of instructors, 97.8 percent of deans, and 97.8 percent of superintendents are white. On the other hand, only 74.2 percent of the students in the junior colleges are white.

In conclusion, it should be stated that in the context of the magnitude of the problem, very little special effort is actually being made for disadvantaged students in California junior colleges. A few innovative, imaginative, potentially effective programs are the work of a few dedicated individuals in a few colleges. This in the face of the fact that in terms of numbers of disadvantaged students, the greatest proportion in institutions of higher education are enrolled in junior colleges. Although active recruitment efforts are being made by the four-year colleges, the number of disadvantaged students served is pitifully small.

The Final Question Form

It was explained in Section III that near the end of the academic year the Final Question Form was sent to all colleges which had not been visited. Table 3a presents a summary of the responses.

The responses from two colleges indicated that those colleges should be visited since each had a significant program for disadvantaged students. The two colleges were visited and are reported in this study. The response from one college indicated that a program for disadvantaged students had been established. Unfortunately, the information was received too late to include in this study. It was most encouraging to discover that during the year, 12 colleges had begun planning compensatory programs. The responses from 21 colleges indicated that there were insignificant numbers of disadvantaged students in those districts.

TABLE 3a

RESULTS FROM FINAL QUESTION FORM

Question	Colleges Whose Respondent Checked This
1. I believe that you should visit this college because we do have a significant program for socio-economically disadvantaged students.	Diablo Valley College* Riverside City College
2. Since submitting the Preliminary Question Form we have developed a significant program for socio-economically disadvantaged students.	Chaffey College
3. I am enclosing copies of studies which have been conducted in connection with the problem of socio-economically disadvantaged students	No response
4. We are now planning a program for disadvantaged students. (Enclose information if possible.)	Cabrillo College Citrus College Imperial Valley College Foothill Junior College Dist. Los Angeles Pierce College Los Angeles Valley College Monterey Penninsula College Orange Coast College Riverside City College Santa Rosa Junior College Southwestern College Yuba College
5. We do not have a significant number of socio-economically disadvantaged students within this district.	Antelope Valley College Barstow College Cerritos College College of the Redwoods College of the Sequoias Cuesta College El Camino College Glendale College Golden West College Grossmont College Lassen College Los Angeles Pierce College Merced College Mt. San Antonio College Orange Coast College Palomar College Reedley College Shasta College Sierra College Taft College West Valley College

*Both of these colleges were subsequently visited.

INTERVIEWS WITH ADMINISTRATORS

The primary purpose of the interviews with administrators was to obtain information about their thinking concerning the role of the junior college in the education of disadvantaged students; the special needs of disadvantaged students; the goals of the college's program for such students; and the extent of the faculty's commitment to, and involvement in, that program. Specific details about the college's program for disadvantaged students were usually obtained from actively involved instructors and counselors. The president, the dean of instruction, and the dean of student personnel were interviewed.in almost all of the colleges visited. The interview schedule for administrators was referred to in Section III.

The responses to the Preliminary Question Form seemed to indicate that there were many disadvantaged students of college age who were not attending a junior college. Thus, an important question concerned the estimated number of disadvantaged students in the community who were not attending the junior college. In almost all cases, the administrators indicated that no statistical data were available, but that they felt that the number of such students was substantial. The administrators were also asked whether there had been any opportunity to recruit those disadvantaged students. In the great majority of cases, the answer was that no recruitment effort had been undertaken. It would appear that Martyn's (1966) assertion that junior colleges are doing little more than maintaining an "Open Door" is accurate. It must be remembered that the visits were made to those junior colleges which had reported that some special efforts were being made on behalf of disadvantaged students. Thus, it might be assumed that even less is being done at the other junior colleges which represent a majority of such institutions in California.

Why some junior colleges have established programs for disadvantaged students and others, where the need is equally great, have not, is a matter of some interest. Administrators in the colleges which had established programs were asked why such programs had been initiated. In a few cases the administrators indicated that there had been pressure from minority student or community groups, or that some of the counselors or instructors had become concerned about the needs of disadvantaged students. In most cases, however, it was reported that the program had been initiated by an administrator--frequently the president himself--who had recognized the necessity of providing some type of extra assistance for disadvantaged students who might otherwise experience academic failure.

Another matter of considerable interest was the nature of faculty attitudes toward compensatory programs--most of which were administratively initiated. Some of the administrators felt that faculty had not responded positively to these attempts to meet the needs of special students. A few of the administrators felt that there was active faculty opposition to the compensatory program. Some administrators indicated that they were aware of some opposition, but that most of the faculty supported the program to some extent. There were only a very few cases in which administrators reported that there was substantial faculty endorsement of the program for disadvantaged students. Several administrators stated that some of the faculty favored the compensatory program because it removed low ability students from the regular transfer classes.

It can be concluded on the basis of the interviews with administrators that, although most of the faculty of the junior colleges which were visited did not oppose the college's program for disadvantaged students, the majority of the faculty appear to be unconcerned and that only a few actively support the program. Since active faculty commitment and support appear to be essential if programs for disadvantaged students are to be as effective as they might be, it may be stated that the majority of California's junior colleges are not ready to mount a massive attack on the problem of equalizing educational opportunity.

Any effective program for disadvantaged students must be structured in terms of the needs of such students. Thus, it seemed important to determine which needs the administrators felt were significant. As expected, there was considerable diversity in the responses to the question, "What do you personally feel are the educational needs of the socio-economically disadvantaged students of college age?" The diversity of response is exemplified by the following:

"Education for citizenship"
"Need to experience participation in programs that allow them to catch up"
"Vocational-technical training"
"Need to be encouraged to come to college"
"Anything that will make him employable--with this comes self-respect and money"
"The ability to read"
"Motivation"
"The need to experience relationships with other people"
"Make them more productive citizens"
"Supportive responses from the college"
"A personalized relationship with the college"
"Skill training"
"Self-awareness"
"More counseling"
"Financial aid"
"Success"
"Knowledge of customs and manners"
"Instructors who care"

"Many different ways of expressing themselves, such as art and music"
"Social acceptance"
"Need to be told they can succeed"
"Opportunity to participate in the life of the college"
"Same as other students"
"The opening of vistas"
"Start where they are"

These responses range qualitatively from the insensitive, "Same as other students" to the perceptive, Supportive responses from the college". It might be suggested here that it is important to have a thorough nowledge and understanding of the special needs of disadvantaged students before the planning for compenatory programs is initiated.

The goals of compensatory programs should be derived directly from the special needs of disadvantaged tudents. Administrators in colleges which operated such programs were asked, "What do you feel are the most mportant goals of the program?" Again, the responses covered a wide range.

"To get more black students to transfer"
"To help in occupational choice"
"To give students an intrinsically valuable program"
"To pick them up where they are and to take them as far as they can go"
"To decrease the dropout rate"
"To increase retention"
"To lead to better positions"
"To give them a salable skill"
"To help people succeed who might not under the traditional system"
"To customize educational offerings"
"To give the academic-risk student a fighting chance"
"To give students who have a history of failure an opportunity to accomplish something meaningful"
"To protect transfer courses"
"To give the vocational-terminal student the general education experiences he should have in a meaningful way that he can handle"
"To weed out students who should be encouraged to find employment"

Again, the necessity for the thoughtful formulation of goals in terms of needs is evident.

One of the major objectives of this present study was to investigate the role of the junior college in the education of disadvantaged students. Administrators were asked whether they thought other agencies, such as MDTA skill centers or adult schools, could do a more effective job of providing very basic instruction for disadvantaged students than could the junior college. There was virtually unanimous agreement among the administrators that offering basic academic work for such students is a task that the junior college must accept and could do more effectively than other agencies. However, when the administrators were asked how effective they thought the junior college has been in providing programs for disadvantaged students, there was almost unanimous agreement that the junior colleges had not been effective in this area!

Administrators were also asked how they thought junior colleges could be more effective in the education of disadvantaged students. Responses to this question covered many areas.

"Slow down offerings"
"More tracking"
"Dedication to the problem"
"In-service training"
"A consortium of colleges working together"
"New methods and approaches"
"More counseling"
"Recruitment"
"High schools should identify disadvantaged students for us"
"Change withdrawal dates and probation policies"
"More money for special centers"
"Give the same emphasis in terms of money, leadership, and instructional aids as we give vocational and transfer programs"
"Contact local employers for jobs"
"Get out into the community"
"More faculty involvement"
"Innovative faculty approaches"
"New materials"
"Need to give people salable skills"

A review of the responses in terms of needs, goals, and effective measures indicates that there is an urgent need for formal, organized, and concentrated in-service programs for all junior college personnel. There need be no hesitancy in participating in such a program since this is a relatively new area in which there are no obvious answers or easy solutions. The best starting point is the frank admission that little is known and much must be done.

Most junior colleges are restricted in what they can do by a chronic lack of money. Administrators were asked whether lack of funds imposed limitations upon what they wanted to do for disadvantaged students. In a few cases the responses were in the negative, but most administrators considered the lack of funds to be a severe limitation. However, when the same administrators were asked what they would do if unlimited funds were available, the responses were often disappointingly unimaginative. Most of the responses are reflected in those which have been listed above.

Socio-economically disadvantaged students are financially poor--many live on the edge of poverty. One of their most urgent needs, therefore, is money. A part-time job is frequently not the answer for a student who needs a maximum amount of time for study. Administrators were asked whether they would favor some type of guaranteed financial aid--a G.I. Bill--for disadvantaged students. A few of the administrators answered that they would definitely favor such an approach, and a few stated that they were definitely opposed to it. Most of the administrators stated that although they were in favor of guaranteed financial aid in the form of grants, they would prefer to have the aid tied to a part-time work program and/or to a required level of academic achievement. Many administrators felt that disadvantaged students would appreciate more the opportunity to attend college if they were required to engage in a part-time work program for the college or an outside agency. Surely, living in poverty, experiencing degradation and discrimination, and suffering the loss of dignity and self-respect is payment enough for an opportunity to attend "democracy's college."

In summary, the administrators interviewed were in almost unanimous agreement that the junior college must accept the major responsibility for the education of disadvantaged students, and that the junior college can perform that function better than any other institution of higher education.

Almost all of the administrators who were interviewed reported that there were significant numbers of disadvantaged students of college age in the community who were not attending, and probably would not attend, a junior college. Only a few administrators reported that recruitment programs had been established or were in some stage of planning.

Most of the remedial programs in which disadvantaged students were enrolled were administratively initiated and apparently were only marginally supported by faculty.

There is an urgent need for in-service training programs which are focused on the characteristics, needs, and problems of disadvantaged students and on effective measures designed to increase the achievement of such students. Such in-service training would be of value to all junior college personnel.

THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

From the 24 colleges at which the student questionnaire was administered, 1,068 questionnaires were collected. It was mentioned in Section II that almost none of the colleges have any means of directly identifying disadvantaged students. In order to do this for the present study, certain of the questions in the student questionnaire were treated as "sieve" questions. These are questions number 28, 32, 35, 37, 38 and 39. The questions may be found in Appendix B and Table 4 shows the answer categories used to dichotomize the questions for classifying students as "disadvantaged" or "not disadvantaged" according to the definitional framework in Section III. These dichotomizations are shown in Table 4 for the six sieve questions.

TABLE 4

QUESTIONS USED FOR IDENTIFYING THE DISADVANTAGED

Question	Not Disadvantaged	Disadvantaged
28. Father's education	High school graduate and up	8th grade or less Some high school Do not know
32. Problem with money	Not often No problem	Very serious problem Yes, most of the time
35. Racial background	Caucasian Japanese-American Other	Afro-American American Indian Mexican-American
37. Occupational level of family wage earner	All other	Unskilled labor
38. Family income	More than $4,000	Less than $4,000
39. Daily newspaper received	Yes	No

For any particular student there are 64 different ways these six questions might be answered. All these separate combinations were subjectively considered and from this analysis emerged the conclusion that if the answers to four or more of the questions were on the "not-disadvantaged" side of the dichotomy, the student simply could not be considered disadvantaged. It also became clear that if four or more answers were on the "disadvantaged" side, a student would have to be considered in this category. There were some cases where the answers broke evenly into three on each side, or where some answers were omitted. These students were put into the "questionable" category shown in the tables in this Section.

The answers to these sieve questions for each student were tabulated and the student was put into one of these three categories. This resulted in total numbers as follows:

Not-Disadvantaged = 453 Questionable = 410 Disadvantaged = 205

It was also considered to be important to analyze the student questionnaire data on the basis of ethnic backgrounds of the students, and for this purpose the responses to Question 35 were sorted to yield three groups: Caucasian, Mexican-American and Afro-American. For this classification the other ethnic groups checked in Question 35 were omitted. On this basis the numbers were as follows:

Caucasian = 397 Mexican-American = 146 Afro-American - 281

Tables 5 through 21 in this Section show the answers to the questionnaire questions for each of these methods of classifying students, although they display the students' responses in a somewhat different order from the way in which the questions were asked. To determine whether or not the differences in responses could arise by chance, two types of statistical tests were applied. For those questions in which a respondent was forced to choose between alternatives the appropriate test is chi-square. Unless, under each table, the level of significances of chi-square is indicated, chi-square for that table is not significant at the .05 level. For those questions where the student could check as many answers as he wished, the appropriate test for each answer is the z-ratio of the differences in the proportions. Since a z-ratio is taken between only two proportions, in the tables that follow it is taken between three separate pairs.

For the first classification, it is taken between "not-disadvantaged: and "disadvantaged." For the racial classification, it is taken between "Caucasian" and "minority" group members, with the minority group members consisting of both Mexican-American and Afro-American students. It is also taken between the answers of Mexican-American students and Afro-American students.

Certain questions in the questionnaire are appropriate only in terms of the particular college the student attended, and combining these answers to get an over-all picture of the students can lead to quite incorrect conclusions because of the effects of such specific college environment variables as special classes, special tutoring, etc. Consequently, these questions were not tabulated in the following tables. These are questions 10 through 15 and 24 through 26. The individual colleges at which questionnaire data were obtained are being provided with the responses of their own students.

In the response patterns for most of the questions, the percentages do not add up to 100. This is because some students omitted answering the question and the response percentages were calculated on the basis of the total N in the particular socio-economic or ethnic group.

Personal information from the students is important for an understanding of what these standards are like, and Tables 5, 6 and 7 are devoted to this. In Table 5, chi-square was not computed for ethnic background because this was one of the sieve questions. In Table 5, it will be noted that although some of the chi-squares are significant, the actual differences in percentages are relatively small. This is even more true in some of the following tables. That is, although the differences shown to be significant are not likely to have arisen by chance, the students in all groups are much more alike than they are different. It is interesting to note that approximately two-thirds of any group of students felt it better to take a special program of classes, while less than one-third felt it better to take the regular classes with an opportunity to get extra individual help. It is quite possible that this is because most of the students to whom the questionnaire was administered were actually in special classes. Furthermore, they were students having had little experience with college and therefore, possessing limited knowledge about possible alternatives. Regardless of the student's socio-economic status or ethnic group, it is clear that a great majority like being at college. Again, although most of the students were enrolled in special remedial classes there was little evidence which indicated that they resented being enrolled in those special classes. Actually, it appeared that disadvantaged students appreciated the special efforts being made for them by the colleges.

Table 6 shows the kinds of home backgrounds the students came from. In an overwhelming majority of cases and for all groups the families want the students to attend college. For the not-disadvantaged--disadvantaged comparisons, chi-square was not computed for the father's education because this was one of the sieve questions. Although it was not a sieve question for mother's education,chi-square was not computed for this on the assumption that the parents' education would be similar enough to render this a relatively meaningless calculation. For both of these questions, however, chi-square was computed when the students were classified into the three ethnic groups shown, and it is interesting to note that in both cases it is significant. Again, the question about receiving a daily newspaper was one of the sieve questions for the not-disadvantaged--disadvantaged classification. One of the most outstanding differences occurs in the question about the approximate number of books in the home, where it is seen the not-disadvantaged group have many more than the disadvantaged, and that Caucasian students have many more than the Mexican-American and Afro-American students. It seems likely that the number of books in the home is a rough measure of the value placed upon reading and academic work. Thus, from the point of view of the factors which might motivate and prepare a student for college work, the Negro and Mexican-American students are "disadvantaged" compared to the Caucasian student.

In Table 7 the questions relating to the estimated level of family income, type of employment of family wage earner, and whether money is a problem were all included in those determining whether or not a student should be considered disadvantaged or not-disadvantaged. Therefore, chi-square was not computed. Note that for the three ethnic groups, however, there is a significant distribution. Another point of interest in this table is the fact that for the disadvantaged and the Afro-American, but not for the Mexican-American, a source of family income was the mother's job in more than an insignificant number of cases, although again there is a great similarity among all groups in the fact that generally it was the father's job that provided the family income. Of major importance for this study was the question relating to the present employment of students, where it may be seen that the total percentage of students in each group working 20 hours per week or more is sizeable. For the disadvantaged students who usually have serious academic problems, this additional time demand is quite significant. For the question, "Is money a problem for you?" Seventy-six percent of the disadvantaged students answered with a "Very serious problem" or, "Yes, most of the time." In ethnic groups it will be noted that these two answers were given by approximately one-half of the students in each of the ethnic groups.

Since pre-college experiences are often related to success in college, these experiences comprised another group of questions, with the results shown in Table 8. It will be noted that there is a considerable difference in the type of high school program between the groups when classified on a socio-economic basis, and between the Caucasian and either of the other two ethnic groups. Almost all of the students were high school graduates, but a sizeable percent of each group did not come to college directly after high school.

In a study of this nature, it is important to inquire into the reasons students attend college. Table 9 shows these reasons, and although some of the percentage differences are statistically significant, a far more interesting point is the similarity of the response of the different groups. It is also worth noting which reasons were checked by most of the students. Whatever the student's socio-economic or ethnic background, he seems to come to college for job training (the area checked most frequently), for general education, to learn about people, to learn about community and world problems, to develop moral and ethical standards, and to develop talents and creative abilities. Many also attend college because of parents wishes and, as might be expected, to meet people of the opposite sex. On the other hand, the athletic programs, draft deferments, and student government activities do not seem to be reasons which cause many students to attend college. Evidently the students who responded to the questionnaire regard college as a serious business and recognize the importance of a college education. On the questionnaire there was an opportunity for students to indicate any other reasons for attending college, other than those listed. Analysis of the responses to this free-response question shows that while many special points were made, nothing in particular stands out that was not already checked in the list.

Table 11 shows the reasons students dislike college, and again the similarities are striking. In general it is seen that the percentages are not very high except for not having enough money, too much pressure, and inadequate time for the academic work. All three of these corroborate the findings discussed earlier that these students are faced with not only academic demands but also with demands on their time for gainful employment. The urgent need for direct financial assistance in the form of grants with no requirements for part-time work is evident. In the part of the question regarding disliking college, the students were free to express any other reasons. An analysis of their responses does not yield any new information or pattern other than shown above.

The ways in which students find college different from high school is another important area to investigate. The results are found in Table 11 and again a remarkable similarity among groups should be noted. The most striking difference is in the area of money and the next highest is in the area of academic difficulty. Transportation also poses more of a problem. The concern about transportation indicates that careful thought should be given to the location of colleges in urban and suburban areas. There is relatively little difference between college and high school in regard to time for studying, and in the light of the previous comments one wonders if the students were under the same time pressure in high school as they seem to be in college. The fewer number of friends in college is probably accounted for by the fact that these students are quite new to college and also that the time students spend on the campus is limited by the need to engage in part-time work. The students were also asked if there were other ways that college differed from high school. As expected, there was a diversity of free responses, some quite trivial, but these answers give a fairly clear indication that the students feel that in college they have more independence, more individual responsibility, and are treated more like adults.

Turning to the ways in which students find college different from their expectations, Table 13, it is interesting to note that most of the students in all groups find the academic demands easier than expected. Perhaps this is because many of the students in this study were in a remedial program. It is also possible that this arises because of a previously-held image in terms of students actually electing to go to college. It is also important to note that about 60 percent of the disadvantaged and minority group students found college more expensive than they thought it would be. Financial difficulties frequently lead students into the vicious circle of additional part-time work, decreased study time, lower academic performance and drop out.

A little less than one half of the students indicated that instructors and counselors took less personal interest in them than they had expected. Disadvantaged students, in particular need to experience supportive responses from the college. It is interesting that a very large percentage of all student groups and especially the Mexican-American group indicated that they were more "on their own" than they thought they would be. The students were also asked, in a free-response type question if there were any other ways college differed from the way they thought it would be, but there seems to be no pattern to these free responses.

Table 14 shows the students' feeling about how much the instructors care for them, and again, there is great similarity among the various groups. Approximately one-half of each group have at least one instructor they feel really cares for them.

Table 15 shows the students' reaction to the counseling offered. For all groups the magnitudes of the percentage in all cases are quite similar. The percent indicating that counseling has been "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" puts counseling in a somewhat better light than is often reported. Although it may be that since all students did not answer, those who did not answer may have felt negatively.

Because any recommendation for college programs needs to be related to students plans for themselves, questions about this were asked, both for the near future and in terms of careers. Table 16 shows students' plans for the near future and it is noteworthy that more than half expect to be in college at least two years. It will be seen that an average slightly more than one-third plan to be working during at least one of the four years. The students do not expect to be in military service, and these figures are strikingly low, even though the group includes both sexes. Table 17 shows the students career plans. Chi-square was not computed for these distributions. Again, the relative similarities for all groups are striking.

Of even more importance than college programs are the present needs and problems of the students, shown in Table 18. The disadvantaged and minority group students indicate that money is a primary problem. Inadequate time for study is also worth noting, especially in the light of previous comments about multiple demands made on students. It is also interesting to note that "confusion" about goals and plans and "inadequacy in verbal expression" are problems common to all of the students included in this study. Those that checked "other" were asked to previously describe what this was. However, analyses of these free responses yield no information other than that tabulated above.

Table 19, showing sources of help for students needs and problems, clearly indicates that all these students rely far more on themselves than they do on help from any other single source. The sources of help from friends is seen to be the next most frequently checked with no differences between Caucasian and minority students nor between Mexican-American and Afro-American students but with significant differences between disadvantaged and not disadvantaged. Faculty members and counselors apparently are not providing a great deal of help for students in any category. This is in some contrast to the percentages of students indicating in their reactions to the counseling service (Table 15) that counseling had been "somewhat helpful" or "very helpful." A possible explanation of this contrast is that the kind of counseling service the students probably thought of was program making, whereas the question about sources of help for needs and problems was focused primarily on more personal problems. A free response question was asked about how college could be more helpful. As expected, there were a variety of responses but many comments indicated that the students would like more personal attention from teachers and counselors.

It is abundantly clear that money is a real problem for many of these students, and it is important to know where the students get the money for college expenses. Tables 20 and 21 show that the students and their families are carrying the financial burden of attending college regardless of ethnic group or socio-economic status. Financial assistance from the college does not seem to be present, although it must be recognized that many of the students answering the questions were quite new to the college.

There was one final free-response question: "Are there any other comments about yourself or the college that you would like to make?" As with the other free-response questions mentioned, there was a wide variety of responses, but a clear thread of approval for the college and what it is doing for the student is discernible.

In summary, some significant points clearly emerge. In attitudes toward college, aspirations, problems and sources of help, the students studied are much more alike than different regardless of the socio-economic or ethnic group to which they belong.

Their most pressing problem is money and, therefore, the need to work while attending college. This need to work creates their next most pressing problem--a lack of an adequate amount of study time.

Many students indicated that they were "on their own" more than they expected to be and that instructors and counselors were not very helpful to them in solving their problems.

It is clear that these students are in college not only for job training, but also because they want to learn to take part in the intellectual life of the world around them, and to develop their own standards and talents. In spite of the difficulties obviously faced by many of the students, they like being in college and appreciate what it offers.

TABLE 5

PERSONAL INFORMATION FROM STUDENTS
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Racial background:						
Afro-American	12	31	48			100
American Indian	3	4	4			
Caucasian	62	23	9	100		
Japanese-American	2	--	--			
Mexican-American	4	17	32		100	
Other	10	10	3			
	(X^2 not computed)			(X^2 not computed)		
Sex:						
Male	65	46	59	70	63	49
Female	33	40	35	29	35	45
	(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Age:						
In teens	62	58	46	57	54	57
In twenties	27	26	44	29	36	24
In or beyond thirties	2	5	10	6	3	9
	(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .05)		
Responses to question, "Do you think it is best for students who need special academic help--						
to take a special program of classes designed to provide this help	67	66	63	66	71	69
(or)						
to take the regular classes with an opportunity to get extra individual help."	28	22	28	29	27	25
Responses to question, "On the whole, which of the following is true for you?						
I like it here more than I dislike it.	72	80	86	88	93	89
I dislike it here more than I like it.?	11	12	5	11	5	9
	(X^2 significant at .02)					

TABLE 6

HOME BACKGROUNDS OF STUDENTS
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Attitude of family toward college attendance of student:						
Urged student to attend	40	38	36	43	34	40
In favor	47	42	47	44	44	51
Neutral	8	8	8	7	13	5
Against	2	2	1	2	1	--
Very much against	--	1	3	1	2	--
Student not sure of attitude	2	4	4	3	5	3
	(X^2 significant at .05)			(X^2 significant at .02)		
Father's education:						
Eighth grade or less	12	30	52	20	53	27
Some high school	10	17	18	14	11	19
High school graduate	27	14	7	21	9	18
Special work beyond high school	12	2	1	10	2	4
Some college	13	7	--	--	3	8
Junior college graduate	5	2	--	3	1	4
Graduate of a four-year college	8	4	--	6	1	4
Post-graduate work	6	1	--	5	1	1
Other	4	1	3	5	1	3
Student did not know	2	9	8	3	9	6
	(X^2 not computed)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Mother's education:						
Eighth grade or less	10	21	44	12	49	19
Some high school	16	23	14	18	21	25
High school graduate	33	22	17	34	12	25
Special work beyond high school	11	5	1	11	2	4
Some college	11	5	2	9	1	9
Junior college graduate	5	3	2	4	1	6
Graduate of a four-year college	7	4	1	4	2	7
Post-graduate work	3	1	--	3	--	1
Other	2	2	3	1	2	1
Students did not know	2	6	5	3	8	2
	(X^2 not computed)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Daily newspaper in home:						
Yes	95	61	35	85	60	65
No	5	24	62	12	37	31
	(X^2 not computed)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Approximate number of books in home:						
0-9	1	2	11	2	6	4
10-19	5	9	18	7	15	9
20-49	15	22	17	14	24	25
50-79	17	10	19	13	20	18
80-100	13	13	13	12	13	14
Over 100	45	30	16	48	19	24
	(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Responses to question, "Do you feel that your home background (newspapers, books, magazines, games) prepared you as well for school work as most of the students here?"						
Yes	61	53	47	59	53	60
No	35	37	47	39	46	37
	(X^2 significant at .01)					

TABLE 7

FINANCIAL BACKGROUNDS OF STUDENTS
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Major source of family income when student was growing up:						
Father's job	93	75	71	92	87	77
Mother's job	5	8	18	5	3	15
Other person's job	1	2	2	1	3	1
Other income	--	2	3	1	5	2
	(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Estimated level of family income:						
Above $4,000 per year	90	42	20	76	45	49
Below $4,000 per year	4	29	72	16	45	40
	(X^2 not computed)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Type of employment: (if family income was from someone's job)						
Professional	7	--	1	6	--	2
Semi-professional	3	1	2	2	--	1
Owner of business	8	2	--	6	3	2
Owner of farm or ranch	1	--	--	1	--	--
White-collar managerial	3	1	--	3	1	1
White-collar non-managerial	13	4	3	8	5	8
Skilled trades	13	6	5	11	8	7
Blue-collar managerial	5	1	1	5	2	1
Unskilled labor	11	13	56	13	29	29
	(X^2 not computed)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Responses to, "Is money a problem for you?":						
A very serious problem	7	14	24	12	12	17
Yes, most of the time	27	39	52	39	41	33
Not often	45	28	17	34	34	33
No problem	21	9	5	14	10	12
	(X^2 not computed)			(X^2 significant at .01)		
Present employment of students:						
40 or more hours per week	11	12	19	10	12	20
30-39 hours per week	6	8	8	7	8	9
20-29 hours per week	19	12	6	17	19	10
10-19 hours per week	17	15	13	16	14	13
Less than 10 hours per week	8	5	4	8	6	4
Not working	23	18	22	22	23	2
	(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .01)		

TABLE 8

PRE-COLLEGE ACADEMIC AND EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUNDS OF STUDENTS
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Mexican-American	Afro-American
High school program:						
Business	22	23	24	18	26	23
Liberal arts	15	15	13	17	16	12
College preparatory	24	18	17	26	16	18
Trade	8	9	16	9	12	12
Vocational	10	19	20	12	16	22
Other	14	9	12	15	10	10
		(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .01)	
Estimated over-all grade average in high school:						
A	--	--	--	1	--	--
A-	1	1	2	1	1	2
B+	3	4	4	3	3	5
B	9	11	16	7	16	12
B-	10	13	15	11	15	12
C+	23	22	28	24	25	28
C	33	29	17	33	23	27
C-	10	9	11	13	11	8
D+	4	3	4	3	5	4
D	2	2	--	4	--	1
D-	--	--	--	1	--	--
F	--	--	--	--	--	--
		(X^2 significant at .02)			(X^2 significant at .01)	
High school graduation:						
Graduates	93	82	94	93	91	95
Non-graduates	4	10	10	7	9	5
		(X^2 significant at .01)				
College attendance:						
Directly after high school	67	45	56	62	67	66
Deferred	32	26	44	36	32	34
		(X^2 significant at .02)				
Activity consuming the most time since high school: (for those who deferred college attendance)						
Employment	23	20	25	26	27	24
Military service	10	8	12	12	12	9
Homemaking	1	4	8	3	3	6
Attending another school	8	6	5	6	5	7
"Not anything, really"	2	6	5	4	6	4
Other	4	10	4	4	4	3
		(X^2 significant at .01)				

TABLE 9

REASONS STUDENTS ATTEND COLLEGE
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
For job training	82	80	85	81	88 **	90	87
Because of parents' wishes	50	45	39 **(a)	46	45	39	48
For the social life	31	30	25	29	27	29	26
For the athletics	10	11	11	9	15 *	16	15
Because there was not much else to do	13	11	12	14	9 *	7	11
For draft deferment	23	15	14 *	22	15 **	12	16
For a general education and appreciation of ideas	78	72	75	76	75	79	73
To learn more about people	57	51	49	54	54	60	50 *
To learn more about community and world problems	51	51	55	46	59 **	60	58
To develop moral and ethical standards	46	53	61 **	40	63 **	62	63
To be with friends	19	17	14	20	16	16	16
To meet people of same sex	26	23	19 *	24	23	25	22
To meet people of opposite sex	49	45	42	49	46	45	47
To develop talents and creative abilities	62	69	70 *	61	69 *	69	69
To take part in student government	8	12	12	5	15 **	12	16
For the prestige of being in college	27	30	33	29	33	33	33
Because someone urged me to	26	26	25	26	28	32	26
Other reason	19	20	16	18	17	19	16

---

*Z-ratio $p < .05$

**Z-ratio $p < .01$

(a) Z-ratios are between not disadvantaged and disadvantaged

TABLE 10

REASONS STUDENTS LIKE COLLEGE
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Interesting classes	82	76	72 **(a)	81	76	84	72 **
Friends of same sex	39	32	26 **	37	30 *	35	27
Friends of opposite sex	54	44	21 **	51	47	47	47
Social life	32	32	25	29	30	30	30
Feeling of "getting somewhere"	73	78	75	75	79	77	80
Athletics	14	15	16	14	17	18	16
Contacts with faculty	16	15	13	16	15	13	15
Contacts with the counselor(s)	14	14	13	12	15	13	16
Student government	4	9	6	3	9 **	7	10
Opportunity for creative expression	35	41	43	33	45 **	40	48
Contacts with other students	51	47	38 **	45	47	48	46
Clubs and activities	15	17	14	12	19 **	21	19
Discussions	32	34	35	31	39 *	34	41
Being away from home	19	19	17	15	20	17	21
Being on one's own	45	39	40	40	41	40	42
Self-discovery	53	56	56	49	62 **	62	62
Living with other students	8	10	8	6	9	9	9
Other	9	10	9	9	8	8	8

---

*Z-ratio $p < .05$

**Z-ratio $p < .01$

(a) Z-ratios are between not disadvantaged and disadvantaged

TABLE 11

REASONS STUDENTS DISLIKE COLLEGE
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Too difficult	12	14	13	10	13	16	11
Too impersonal	16	12	14	19	13 *	15	11
Feeling of being alone	21	13	22	21	21	25	19
Unsatisfactory social life	12	11	15	14	11	10	11
Feeling of not "getting anywhere"	20	16	15	18	17	17	17
Disliking being away from home	2	3	5 *(a)	2	3	3	3
Disinterest in classes	13	18	15	15	14	9	16 *
Too much pressure	25	20	27	25	24	23	24
Inadequate time for the academic work	19	23	33 **	19	23	27	21
Too few friends of same sex	8	5	9	8	6	8	4
Too few friends of opposite sex	16	11	16	17	11 **	12	10
Poor mental or physical health	2	5	12 **	4	4	3	4
Not having enough money	26	41	47 **	37	40	49	35 **
Feeling of being different from others	11	13	12	9	13	14	12
Being too much on one's own	5	7	8	3	6	8	5
Unplesant housing conditions	4	6	8 **	4	6	6	6
Other	16	12	12	15	10 *	15	8 *

---

*Z-ratio p<.05

**Z-ratio p<.01

(a)Z-ratios are between not disadvantaged and disadvantaged

TABLE 12

WAYS IN WHICH STUDENTS FIND COLLEGE DIFFERENT FROM HIGH SCHOOL

(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Academic difficulty:						
Harder than high school	55	50	52	51	51	53
Same as high school	33	38	37	36	39	38
Easier than high school	12	11	9	12	10	8
Money:						
More problem than in high school	70	78	85	73	86	75
No more problem than in high school	19	15	9	17	10	16
Less problem than in high school	10	6	6	9	5	9
		(X^2 significant at .01)				
Transportation:						
More problem than in high school	38	48	55	43	49	51
No more problem than in high school	37	38	30	35	40	32
Less problem than in high school	25	15	15	22	12	16
		(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .02)	
Time for studying:						
More than in high school	38	34	27	35	40	30
Same as in high school	23	26	24	26	23	23
Less than in high school	38	39	46	39	35	46
Personal interest taken by teachers:						
More than in high school	26	30	30	26	24	31
Same as in high school	32	36	31	32	37	34
Less than in high school	42	32	39	41	38	36
Personal interest taken by counselor:						
More than in high school	34	33	31	35	27	27
Same as in high school	31	36	38	33	40	40
Less than in high school	33	28	30	31	33	30
Number of friends at college:						
More than in high school	23	21	18	23	14	18
Same as in high school	32	33	28	29	33	32
Fewer than in high school	43	44	55	47	53	50
Group membership:						
More alone than in high school	39	34	41	43	36	39
Same as in high school	32	35	32	33	42	32
More a member of a group now	22	30	29	23	22	28

TABLE 13

WAYS IN WHICH STUDENTS FIND COLLEGE DIFFERENT FROM EXPECTATIONS
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Academic difficulty:						
Harder than expected	33	45	37	32	45	40
Easier than expected	64	54	55	64	51	58
		(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .01)	
Expense:						
More than expected	55	63	61	54	64	58
Less than expected	51	35	37	39	34	40
Transportation:						
Harder than expected	34	48	48	37	46	45
Easier than expected	53	44	44	50	51	51
		(X^2 significant at .01)				
Time for study:						
More than expected	56	53	49	55	51	53
Less than expected	41	46	49	41	48	45
Personal interest taken by teachers:						
More than expected	52	55	52	51	49	56
Less than expected	42	43	47	41	49	41
Personal interest taken by counselor:						
More than expected	51	53	49	47	47	51
Less than expected	43	42	44	45	51	42
		(X^2 significant at .01)				
Number of friends:						
More than expected	56	54	44	51	51	53
Fewer than expected	36	41	45	37	46	43
		(X^2 significant at .05)				
Independence:						
More "on one's own" than expected	82	77	78	77	90	81
More "looked after" than expected	11	14	13	13	8	14
Group membership:						
More alone than expected	46	45	54	47	51	46
More a group member than expected	42	42	45	39	45	48

TABLE 14

STUDENTS' FEELINGS ABOUT HOW MUCH INSTRUCTORS CARE FOR THEM
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Really Caring:							
Several Instructors	14	20	18	14	20 *	16	22
Two or three instructors	17	16	13	17	14	14	15
One Instructor	14	13	13	15	14	14	14
None	10	5	7	10	4 **	3	5
Caring Some:							
Several instructors	19	17	21	20	17	18	17
Two or three instructors	29	22	28	27	27	29	26
One instructor	16	10	16	15	15	16	14
None	4	2	2	5	2 *	1	2
Not Seeming to Care:							
Several instructors	13	10	11	16	8 **	9	8
Two or three instructors	9	6	6	8	5	5	5
One instructor	11	8	7	10	8	11	7
None	13	12	11	13	11	11	10

---

*Z-ratio $p < .05$

**Z-ratio $p < .01$

(a) Z-ratios are between not disadvantaged and disadvantaged

TABLE 15

STUDENTS' REACTIONS TO COUNSELING SERVICE
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Counseling interview contacts:						
Those having had any	77	63	72	77	66	68
Those not having had any	21	33	23	20	32	30
		(X^2 significant at .01)			(X^2 significant at .01)	
Feeling about the counseling received: (for those having had contact)						
Very helpful	32	29	37	29	35	32
Somewhat helpful	29	24	26	31	23	26
Not very helpful	13	11	11	13	11	10
No help	6	7	4	7	4	4
Feeling about counselor's concern:						
"Really concerned about me as an individual"	27	21	29	29	21	24
"Somewhat concerned about me as an individual"	37	32	34	35	33	37
"Does not seem concerned about me as an individual"	15	15	15	15	17	10

TABLE 16

STUDENTS' PLANS FOR THE NEAR FUTURE
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Be in College:							
This year	71	60	59 **(a)	73	59 **	67	54 *
Next year	69	59	56 **	69	59 **	65	56
The third year	50	43	33 **	49	42	47	40
The fourth year	45	46	33 **	45	39	36	41
Be Working:							
This year	35	32	30	36	32 **	33	32
Next year	36	37	35	39	36	36	37
The third year	40	38	35	41	37	35	38
The fourth year	38	40	36	41	38	34	41
Be in the Military:							
This year	2	2	2	2	3	5	2
Next year	7	5	2 **	8	4*	8	2 **
The third year	11	8	8	12	8*	13	5 **
The fourth year	11	5	10	12	9	16	5 **
Be Married:							
This year	6	6	6	8	6	7	5
Next year	17	10	8 **	9	10	9	10
The third year	14	7	9	13	12	14	11
The fourth year	17	17	15	15	19	19	20

---

*Z-ratios $p < .05$
**Z-ratios $p < .01$
(a)Z-ratios are between not disadvantaged and disadvantaged

TABLE 17

STUDENTS' CAREER PLANS
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Military	2	2	1	2	4	2
Owner of business	13	10	5	12	3	10
Business (administration)	7	8	9	7	10	8
Business (clerical)	9	11	7	8	8	11
Sales	1	1	2	2	1	1
Medicine or dentistry	1	2	--	1	--	2
Para-medical	7	5	9	4	2	13
Law	1	1	--	2	--	1
Ministry	--	1	--	--	1	1
Scientific research	--	2	1	1	1	2
College teaching	2	4	1	3	3	2
Public school teaching	10	17	16	12	19	10
Art, music, drama	8	6	6	7	5	5
Social work	6	6	7	5	6	11
Technical (electronics, etc.)	12	9	19	12	16	16
Farming, forestry, conservation	5	2	2	5	1	2
Government (civil service)	4	5	2	3	5	3
Homemaking	2	1	1	2	--	2
Other	18	18	15	20	22	13
No idea now	11	8	7	15	9	4

(X^2 not computed)

TABLE 18

STUDENTS' PRESENT NEEDS AND PROBLEMS
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Inadequate money	36	54	65 **(a)	44	54**	57	53
Inadequate time for study	26	36	43 **	30	37 *	36	37
Poor health	2	4	3	4	3	1	3
Loneliness	12	16	17	14	15	20	13
Confusion about self	34	25	27	31	29	30	29
Confusion about goals and plans	42	31	37	42	34 *	32	36
Need for assistance with course work	19	20	31 **	17	23	22	23
Need for assistance "straightening myself out"	18	19	16	17	20	23	19
Insecurity or shyness	28	26	27	31	24 *	29	22
Deciding what to do about the draft	25	18	17 *	24	18 *	20	17
Deciding what to do about relationship(s) with other person(s)	28	18	20 *	26	24	25	23
Inadequacy in verbal expression	38	36	40	36	43 *	47	41
Other	8	6	7	7	5	6	5

---

*Z-ratio $p < .05$

**Z-ratio $p < .01$

(a) Z-ratios are between not disadvantaged and disadvantaged

TABLE 19

SOURCES OF HELP FOR STUDENTS' NEEDS AND PROBLEMS
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
One friend	14	16	12	14	15	19	14
Friends	30	22	18 **(a)	24	25	25	24
Family member at college	2	7	6 *	4	5	3	6
Faculty member	16	12	15	12	17	14	19
Dean	--	1	2 *	1	1	1	1
Counselor	17	14	14	13	15	16	14
Tutor	4	4	7	3	7 **	3	9 *
Course or courses	9	9	9	8	10	11	9
Job placement office	4	7	7	4	7 *	4	9
Doctor or nurse at college	--	1	1	1	1	1	1
Own efforts	46	42	45	46	45	44	45
Clubs or groups	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
Religous worker	3	7	2	3	6 **	5	7
Financial aid officer	1	4	5 **	2	5 *	5	5
Other	5	5	1 **	5	4	5	3

---

*Z-ratio $p < .05$
**Z-ratio $p < .01$
(a) Z-ratios are between not disadvantaged and disadvantaged

TABLE 20

SOURCES OF MONEY FOR BOARD, ROOM AND CLOTHING
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Parents	42	33	30 **(a)	41	28 **	31	26
Student's own job	29	24	25	30	21 **	24	20
Economic grant through the college	--	7	1	1	1	1	1
Scholarship	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
G. I. Bill	5	4	8	7	4	8	3 *
Loan	--	--	1	--	1	1	1
Student's savings	12	8	7	11	6 **	8	5
Wife's or husband's earnings	2	4	5	6	4	6	2 *
Other	2	4	3	3	4	2	4

TABLE 21

SOURCES OF MONEY FOR BOOKS, OTHER COLLEGE SUPPLIES AND TRANSPORTATION
(Percentages)

	Not Disadvantaged	Questionable	Disadvantaged	Caucasian	Minority	Mexican-American	Afro-American
Parents	46	39	31 **(a)	43	38 **	38	37
Student's own job	51	43	43	50	45	47	44
Economic grant through the college	--	3	3 **	1	2	1	2
Scholarships	1	3	5 **	1	4 **	7	3
G. I. Bill	7	6	12 *	8	10	12	9
Loan	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
Student's savings	23	49	14 *	23	17 *	23	14 *
Wife's or husband's earnings	3	5	6 *	5	6	7	5
Other	3	7	8 **	5	5	5	6

---

*Z-ratio $p < .05$

**Z-ratio $p < .01$

(a)Z-ratios are between not disadvantaged and disadvantaged

THE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

The faculty traditionally has had a high degree of control over the nature of the academic and vocational offerings of a college. Thus, it is unlikely that a massive attack, even a limited, experimental attack, upon the problem of providing equal educational opportunity for all students can be mounted in a community college without the full support and cooperation of the faculty. The growing participation of faculty senates in the decision-making process indicates that the success of administratively initiated programs for disadvantaged students will be limited by the lack of faculty involvement--and it is quite clear that the great majority of such programs are administratively initiated. Thus, it seemed important to investigate faculty attitudes toward, and knowledge about, programs for disadvantaged students.

It has been explained previously that the faculty questionnaire was sent to a representative ten percent sample of all instructors and to all counselors in California junior colleges. Approximately 68 percent of the questionnaires were returned providing a total of 1,170 responses. Approximately 65 percent of the counselors completed and returned the questionnaire.

Table 22 shows the percentage responses of the total group to the items of the first section of the questionnaire. For the purpose of additional analysis the major field, sex, number of years of employment, age, and the type of college employed in were controlled. Table 23 shows the complete classification of the responses to Item 1 of the first section of the questionnaire. The classification of colleges as Urban, Suburban, or Rural is presented in Table 27. All of the colleges listed under the designation Rural are not rural in the strictest sense, but they are different from the Urban and Suburban colleges with respect to their locations and the populations served.

All of the items of the questionnaire were classified as shown in Table 23. However, since most of the differences in response were found to be small, the complete classification for Items 2 through 11 will not be presented in this report. When appropriate, reference will be made to a few large differences.

Before presenting an analysis of the first section of the questionnaire, it is necessary to direct attention to the educational practices referred to in the individual items. Each of the practices was found to be a component of at least one of the programs for disadvantaged students presented in this and other reports. Indeed, most of the practices are generally accepted as being both desirable and effective. Thus, it is difficult to understand why some counselors and instructors indicated that the practices were of Questionable Value, of No Value, or Inappropriate--and only a very small percentage did respond in that manner. However, since most of the practices are at least Desirable, a valid measure of the value instructors and counselors place upon those practices is the percentage who indicated that they were either Essential or Highly Desirable.

Hereinafter, for simplicity, the total group including instructors, counselors, and librarians will be designated as "faculty".

The purpose of the first section of the faculty questionnaire was to investigate what educational value and what budget priority faculty would assign to various components of a program for disadvantaged students. Item 1 concerns the availability of special remedial classes. The percentage responses are shown in Table 22. The faculty evidently regard special remedial classes as being quite important. It is interesting to note also that they would assign a high budget priority to such classes. It is surprising indeed that more special classes have not been established for disadvantaged students. Table 23 indicates that counselors and librarians assign a much higher educational value and priority to special classes than do any group of instructors.

The use of tutoring is increasing and, generally, is felt to be effective in assisting disadvantaged students. Nevertheless, as shown in Table 23a, the faculty assigned a much lower educational value and budget priority to tutoring than they did to special remedial classes--and the literature indicates increasing doubt about the effectiveness of the latter. Counselors assigned a much higher priority to individual tutoring than did any faculty group. Faculty from urban colleges valued tutoring more than did those from suburban or rural colleges. It would be reasonable to assume that faculty from urban colleges would be more aware of the special needs of disadvantaged students and of the effectiveness of individual tutoring.

One of the needs mentioned most frequently during the interviews with administrators was the need for additional counseling for disadvantaged students. Item 3 indicates that 63 percent of the faculty consider additional counseling to be either essential or highly desirable and 54 percent would assign either the highest or a high budget priority to it. As would be expected, counselors assigned both a higher educational value and budget priority to this item than did instructors. It is possible that instructors indicated that they valued additional counseling not so much because they are convinced of its value to students, but because they think that it might be effective in diverting more low ability and disadvantaged students into remedial, low level, or vocational and technical programs.

A question in the second section of the questionnaire revealed that almost 60 percent of the faculty agreed that there were many disadvantaged students in the community who had not enrolled in the junior college. It is surprising to note in Item 4 of the first section that only 16 percent of the faculty feel that recruitment is essential and only 26 percent consider it highly desirable. It is even more surprising to note that

TABLE 22

TOTAL RESPONSES TO SECTION I OF THE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

	EDUCATIONAL VALUE						BUDGET PRIORITY				
	Essential 1	Highly Desirable 2	Desirable 3	Questionable Value 4	No Value 5	Inappropriate 6	Highest Priority 1	High Priority 2	Medium Priority 3	Low Priority 4	Considered Only If Additional Funding Available 5
1. Adequate availability of special, remedial-level classes for disadvantaged students with weak academic backgrounds	52	28	13	5		1	35	37	19	5	3
2. Adequate availability of individual tutoring for disadvantaged students with weak academic backgrounds	19	36	35	8		2	14	26	35	14	11
3. Availability of additional, special counseling for disadvantaged students	28	35	28	7		1	19	37	29	10	5
4. Active recruitment of disadvantaged students who otherwise would not seek entrance	16	26	31	20	2	4	12	22	31	19	16
5. Availability of guaranteed financial support to meet minimum needs of disadvantaged students	24	28	31	11	1	4	21	27	24	10	18
6. Availability of special help for the disadvantaged in securing part-time jobs while enrolled in college	25	40	27	6		2	20	39	29	8	5
7. Employment or assignment of one or two staff members with understanding and commitment to work full-time with disadvantaged students	25	32	27	11	1	3	22	30	26	11	10
8. Medical screening for disadvantaged students to discover problems in diet, eyesight, use of drugs, etc.	19	35	35	7	1	3	15	29	37	11	8
9. Taking some of the college offerings out into the disadvantaged community	17	27	28	25	3	5	10	23	27	20	19
10. Development of ways to better identify those students who are disadvantaged	18	26	37	14	2	3	12	24	36	18	10
11. Development of special instructional materials for disadvantaged students	27	32	28	10	1	2	22	32	28	11	7

(Figures shown are percentages, rounded to the nearest unit.)

TABLE 23

RESPONSES TO THE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO MAJOR FIELD, SEX, YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, AGE, AND COLLEGE LOCATION

	BUDGET PRIORITY					EDUCATIONAL VALUE					
Adequate availability of special, emedial level classes for disad- ntaged students with weak academic ckgrounds.	Highest Priority 1	High Priority 2	Medium Priority 3	Low Priority 4	Considered Only If Additional Funding Available 5	Essential 1	Highly Disirable 2	Desirable 3	Questionable Value 4	No Value 5	Inappropriate 6
ajor Field											
15 Librarians	53	33	7	7		60	33		7		
59 Counselors	46	36	14	4	1	66	22	7	4		1
15 Lib. Arts Instrs.	31	35	22	7	5	46	28	18	6		2
96 Business Instrs.	28	36	27	5	3	43	33	16	7		1
64 P. E. Instrs.	29	41	24	3	3	49	32	17			2
119 Semi-Pro & T. T. Instrs.	22	47	22	3	5	39	41	16	2		2
ex											
809 Men	32	39	19	5	4	50	28	4	5		2
298 Women	44	31	19	4	1	59	27	10	3		
Years of Employment											
297 Empl. 0-3 Years	37	36	18	6	3	55	24	15	5		1
860 Empl. 4 Yrs. or More	35	38	19	5	3	52	30	13	4		2
Age											
81 Age 21-30	27	43	19	7	4	47	27	19	7		
339 Age 31-40	37	38	16	5	4	55	26	11	5	1	2
736 Age 41-up	35	36	20	5	3	52	29	14	4		1
College Location											
281 in Urban Colleges	43	35	13	6	3	59	24	11	5		1
229 in Suburban Colleges	34	34	20	7	5	48	25	19	4	1	2
87 in Rural Colleges	26	43	24	5	2	51	36	9	2		1
1,170 Respondents (Total Group)	35	37	19	5	3	52	28	13	5		1

(Figures shown are percentages, rounded to the nearest unit.)

TABLE 23a

CLASSIFICATION OF COLLEGES

URBAN

Bakersfield
Cerritos
Compton
Fresno
Laney
Long Beach
Los Angeles City
Los Angeles Trade-Tech.
Merritt
Pasadena
Sacramento City

SUBURBAN

American River
Cabrillo
Diablo Valley
Foothill
Golden West
Marin
Mt. San Antonio
San Diego Mesa
San Mateo
Southwestern
West Valley

RURAL

Antelope Valley
Coalinga
Desert
Gavilan
Hancock
Hartnell
Imperial Valley
Lassen
Merced
Mira Costa
Mt. San Jacinto
Napa
Palo Verde
Porterville
Redwoods
Reedley

26 percent consider recruitment of questionable value at best. Only 34 percent of the faculty would assign the highest or high budget priority to recruitment. Again, counselors valued recruitment of disadvantaged students higher than any of the groups of instructors. It is interesting to note that instructors and counselors in suburban colleges assigned a higher educational value to this item than did those in urban or rural colleges. It is possible that the suburban college instructors and counselors responded in this way because such colleges appear to enroll a relatively small number of disadvantaged students.

Responses to the student questionnaire indicated that there was a genuine need for financial aid for disadvantaged students. It is generally recognized that such students seldom qualify for scholarship grants, and that they are reluctant to borrow money to finance their education. It is, therefore, somewhat surprising that in Item 5 of Table 22 faculty did not assign a higher educational value to the availability of guaranteed financial support to meet even the minimum needs of disadvantaged students. Counselors did not assign a higher value to financial support than did the instructors. The response to this item probably reflects the generally held feeling in our culture that one should earn what he receives. Eleven percent of faculty indicated that they felt that guaranteed financial aid was of questionable value. It seems possible, however, that disadvantaged students, who are likely to experience academic difficulty in college, should be relieved of the necessity to work while they learn. Perhaps no other course of action will assist disadvantaged students to escape from the socio-economic conditions which are the causes of their disadvantage.

Item 6 of Table 22 indicates that faculty value special help in securing part-time jobs more than they do guaranteed financial help. Physical education instructors apparently value such supportive services much more than any other group. Almost 60 percent of faculty placed a high, or highest, budget priority on this item. Evidently there is general recognition that disadvantaged students do have financial problems.

During the course of this study it was noted that several colleges were making multiple efforts to establish a program for disadvantaged students but that such efforts lacked coordination. On the other hand, the more effective programs that were observed were coordinated by one or two staff members who possessed considerable insight into the needs of disadvantaged students and a strong commitment to assist them. At least one such staff member was a member of a minority group. Thus, it appears that the employment of a program coordinator, particularly one who is a member of a minority group, is highly desirable. Item 7 of Table 22 indicates that little more than one-half of the faculty indicated that they agreed and would assign about the same budget priority to the establishment of such a position.

Disadvantaged students frequently have had inadequate medical care. Undiscovered physical disabilities may prevent them from achieving their full potential. Four-year colleges provide extensive medical care for all students. Community colleges normally provide physical examinations only for athletes and are severely restricted in the types of medical care they are legally able to provide. Item 8 shows that only 54 percent of faculty consider medical screening to be essential, or highly desirable, and only 14 percent would assign highest, or high, budget priority to such services.

Several community colleges, or districts, including North Orange County Junior College District, Modesto Junior College, Long Beach City College, and Pasadena City College have made major efforts to offer courses in many different community locations. One of the objectives is to make college offerings readily available to youth and adults in the community who would not, for a number of reasons, come to the college. Another objective is to attract those youth and adults to the college after they have had an initial exposure to college instructors and courses. The technique is reported to be effective by those colleges which use it. It has already been reported that it is widely recognized by administrators and faculty that many disadvantaged youth do not enroll in the community college. It is difficult, therefore, to explain why only 44 percent of the faculty indicated in Item 9 of Table 22 that taking some of the college offerings out into the community was either essential or highly desirable, and 25 percent of the faculty felt it to be of questionable value. One possible explanation is that a significant proportion of the faculty are not aware of the needs of the disadvantaged student and have little interest in programs designed to equalize educational opportunity. Only 33 percent of the faculty assigned highest or high priority to this item. Only 31 percent of instructors of vocational or technical courses felt that this item was either essential or highly desirable, and only 24 percent would assign highest or high budget priority to it. Surely faculty will not be content to wait within the confines of the campus for disadvantaged students who apparently will not voluntarily enroll in the college. It is necessary to do more than maintain an open door policy if equality of educational opportunity is to be achieved.

Item 10 of Table 22 shows that faculty responded in a similar manner to the necessity for developing methods of identifying disadvantaged students. The problem encountered most often during the course of this present study was that the great majority of colleges had not, and could not, identify disadvantaged students. Of course, many educators feel that disadvantaged students should not be identified because of the effects of labeling students. However, identification without labeling is possible. It does appear to be impossible, or at least very difficult, to assist disadvantaged students if they are not identified. For example, how can special loan funds, or other financial aids, be made available to disadvantaged students unless it is known who they are? It is interesting to note that a larger percentage of physical education instructors indicated that they attached a higher educational value to this item than did the counselors. If counselors do not understand the necessity to identify disadvantaged students, it is difficult to believe that effective compensatory measures will be undertaken in the community colleges in the near future.

During interviews, it was pointed out frequently by presidents and deans that the available instructional materials--particularly those of a remedial nature--were inappropriate for disadvantaged students. Thus, it was expected that this item would be rated as being much more desirable than it actually was. Thirteen percent of faculty indicated that such materials were of questionable value at best. However, almost 60 percent of faculty indicated that special instructional materials were either essentially or highly desirable. It is interesting to note that 67 percent of the counselors, but only 53 percent of the liberal arts instructors and 72 percent of the librarians, felt that special instructional materials were of considerable importance.

If the percentages of the total group who indicated in each of the items that the item was Essential or Highly Desirable are totaled, a rank order of priority can be established as follows:

		Educational Value	Budget Priority
1.	Special remedial-level classes	70%	72%
2.	Special help in securing part-time jobs	65	59
3.	Additional counseling	63	56
4.	Special instructional materials	59	54
5.	Employment of one or two staff members to work with disadvantaged students	57	52
6.	(a) Individual tutoring	54	40
	(b) Medical screening	54	44
7.	Guaranteed financial support	52	48
8.	(a) Taking college offerings into community	44	33
	(b) Identification of students	44	36
9.	Active recruitment	42	34

It is difficult to comment about the order of priority indicated in this summary since there is little research about the effectiveness of the individual items in terms of increasing the achievement of disadvantaged students. Coleman's research (1966) seems to demonstrate that some of the highly rated items have little or no effect upon achievement. It is important to note, however, that the most innovative and imaginative measures being taken by several community colleges include the items from the lower half of the list, which a smaller proportion of the faculty consider to be essential or highly desirable. Evidently, if effective programs for disadvantaged students are to be undertaken, a large segment of the faculty will have to be convinced of the value of such measures as: the identification and recruitment of disadvantaged students, individual tutoring, and guaranteed financial support. It is particularly discouraging that such a small proportion of instructors and counselors recognize the urgent need for an active program of recruitment to bring into the community college the significant numbers of disadvantaged students who will otherwise not enroll.

The second section of the questionnaire consisted of thirty statements, many of which were suggested by the literature and some of which were made by administrators, counselors, or instructors during the interviews. Many of the statements are controversial. The purpose of this section is to report and comment on the opinions of instructors and counselors. The questionnaire and the percentage responses of the total group are found in Table 24. Table 25 shows how responses were controlled for major field, sex, years of employment, age, and type of institution employed in. As in the first section of the questionnaire, complete tables have not been included and will be alluded to only when large differences exist. Again, the total group will be referred to as "faculty."

In Item 1 of the first section of the questionnaire (Table 22) 70 percent of the faculty indicated that adequate availability of special, remedial-level classes for disadvantaged students were either Essential or Highly Desirable. Item 1 of the second section (Table 24) referred to such classes in a slightly different way. In this item, 72 percent of the faculty disagreed with the statement that a special instructional program for disadvantaged students is not necessary because the curriculum of the junior college is broad enough to meet the needs of those students. Only a very few junior colleges actually have special courses for disadvantaged students. It has been pointed out several times that most remedial-level courses were established for low ability students identified by one of several types of entrance tests. It is difficult to explain why special classes for disadvantaged students are not more numerous since a large majority of the faculty believe that there is need for these classes.

Some of the administrators, counselors, and faculty who were interviewed during the course of the study questioned the wisdom of placing students in a required series of remedial courses. Some staff members extended the discussion to the value of remedial courses per se. More than a few felt that remedial courses do not remediate --they terminate. Many of those who did not think that low ability or disadvantaged students should be placed in a required series of remedial classes stated that such classes could not be effective unless the student elected to enter them when he felt a need for help in a particular area. Items 2 and 3 of the questionnaire were included to determine how the majority of the faculty felt about this problem. It was not surprising to find that 72 percent of the faculty agreed that low ability students should be placed in remedial classes-- this is common practice in junior colleges. An almost identical percentage of the faculty felt that disadvantaged students who score very low on entrance tests should be placed in a required series of remedial classes, even though it is generally agreed that entrance test scores do not measure accurately the ability of such students.

TABLE 24

TOTAL RESPONSES TO SECTION II OF THE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	I Have No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5
1. A special instructional program for disadvantaged students is not necessary since the existing curriculum of the junior college is sufficiently broad to meet the educational needs of such students.	5	18	5	47	25
2. Students whose scores on entrance tests fall into the lowest decile should be placed in a required series of remedial courses.	29	43	7	15	6
3. Disadvantaged students whose scores on entrance tests fall in the lowest decile should be placed in a required series of remedial courses.	29	41	8	16	6
4. Such strategies as delayed course or college withdrawal dates and/or non-punitive grading systems ought to be introduced to reduce the possibility of academic failure of disadvantaged students.	22	34	12	22	10
5. The increasing gap between the achievement of middle class and disadvantaged students as they advance through the grades is a clear indication of the failure of our public school system.	14	23	17	33	13
6. Measured mean differences in the intelligence of Negroes and whites are caused by the same factors that cause differences in the intelligence of individuals within each group.	13	32	22	21	11
7. Disadvantaged students are generally aware of the "ground rules" for success in college.	1	16	12	48	23
8. Rather than give direct financial aid to disadvantaged students, they should be required to engage in a "work-study" program because this will insure that they will value their opportunity for a college education.	16	36	16	24	8
9. Students whose entrance test scores indicate that they are not able to do college work ought to be placed in vocational programs.	8	20	13	38	21
10. Basically the culture of the disadvantaged is one of hopelessness and despair.	6	31	21	31	11
11. The problem of programs for disadvantaged students cannot be solved unless the junior colleges are given sufficient additional funds to devote to such programs.	34	42	9	12	3
12. High standards of achievement can be maintained in an "open door" college.	28	48	9	11	4
13. The very existence of special programs for identified disadvantaged students indicates that the culture and values of such students are less worthy and meaningful than that of the middle class student.	1	6	10	43	39
14. There are no significant racial differences in achievement motivation.	8	20	18	39	15
15. An important function of the educational system is to make achievement independent of background.	30	54	8	6	2

(Figures shown are percentages, rounded to the nearest unit.)

TABLE 24 (Continued)

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	I Have No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5
16. Four-year college standards and requirements frequently prevent the junior colleges from meeting the needs of disadvantaged students.	10	39	10	35	6
17. It is appropriate for instructors to use middle-class values as guides in formulating goals for and content of special courses for disadvantaged students.	2	18	18	43	20
18. In-service programs which emphasize the understanding of the attitudes, values, and aspirations of disadvantaged students, should be conducted for instructors engaged in teaching such students.	41	50	5	3	1
19. The existing entrance requirements for junior colleges should not be changed.	24	51	12	11	2
20. During the first year in a junior college disadvantaged students ought to be graded on a scale different from that used for regular students in junior colleges.	4	18	18	39	21
21. Junior college courses can be taught in such a way that immediate and concrete rewards can be seen by disadvantaged students.	19	61	14	5	1
22. The value of most remedial courses in terms of increasing student achievement is questionable.	6	18	16	48	13
23. The value of most remedial courses in terms of preparing students for transfer courses is questionable.	5	24	16	46	9
24. Disadvantaged students in junior colleges find that most courses which they are required to take are of little relevance in terms of their needs, interests, or concerns.	8	41	27	22	2
25. The value systems of disadvantaged students are not compatible with the requirements of a college education.	4	23	28	38	8
26. Disadvantaged students whose communication skills are inadequate ought to be referred to some other institution, such as an adult high school, for upgrading or retraining.	7	13	13	50	16
27. Students should be grouped heterogeneously with regard to ability in most general education courses.	6	42	15	31	7
28. Disadvantaged students often have problems which prevent them from demonstrating creativity.	12	56	18	10	3
29. There are large numbers of disadvantaged students in this district who have graduated from high schools but who have not enrolled in junior colleges.	13	46	32	8	1
30. Special programs for disadvantaged students are just another method of preserving de facto segregation.	2	7	14	53	24

(Figures shown are percentages, rounded to the nearest unit.)

TABLE 25

RESPONSES TO THE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO MAJOR FIELD, SEX, YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, AGE, AND COLLEGE LOCATION

1. A special instructional program for disadvantaged students is not necessary since the existing curriculum of the junior college is sufficiently broad to meet the educational needs of such students.	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	I Have No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5
Major Field					
15 Librarians		7	7	80	7
359 Counselors	2	15	2	46	35
415 Lib. Arts Instrs.	6	20	8	43	23
96 Business Instrs.	8	20	1	58	13
64 P. E. Instrs.	3	23	3	55	16
119 Semi-Pro & T. T. Instrs.	9	21	5	47	18
Sex					
809 Men	5	18	5	47	25
298 Women	3	18	3	49	28
Years of Employment					
297 Empl. 0-3 Years	1	15	4	49	31
860 Empl. 4 Years or More	6	19	5	47	23
Age					
81 Age 21-30		11	7	52	30
339 Age 31-40	5	16	4	45	31
736 Age 41-up	5	20	5	48	22
College Location					
281 in Urban Colleges	6	19	4	47	24
229 in Suburban Colleges	6	17	4	47	26
87 in Rural Colleges	5	16	5	48	27
1,170 Respondents (Total Group)	5	18	5	47	25

(Figures shown are percentages, rounded to the nearest unit.)

The literature indicates that disadvantaged students, including those with very low test scores, have many needs which to them are more immediate than the remediation of communication or numerical skills. If such needs are not met, the disadvantaged student is not likely to persist long in college. There is an urgent need for a new approach in the education of disadvantaged students. Their most immediate needs probably will not be met by establishing yet another stratum of remedial classes.

Although, in Item 4, 56 percent of the faculty agreed that the strategies mentioned there should be introduced to reduce the possibility of failure for disadvantaged students, there is little evidence of such action in the colleges. It is interesting to note that 51 percent of the liberal arts instructors and 74 percent of the counselors agreed with the statement.

There is ample evidence of the increasing gap between the achievement of middle class and disadvantaged students as they progress through the grades. In Item 15, 84 percent of the faculty agreed that an important function of the educational system is to make achievement independent of background. Clearly, our schools have failed to do so for millions of students. However, Item 5 indicates that only 37 percent of the faculty agreed that the achievement gap is clear indication of the failure of our schools--presumably because the schools have performed reasonably well for middle-class students.

There is a considerable diversity of opinion regarding Item 6 of the questionnaire. It seems clear that if the same factors which cause individual differences in measured intelligence are not operating to cause differences between the means of the two groups, then some other factor, or factors, must be doing so. It would be interesting to ask the 32 percent of the faculty who disagreed with the statement to identify the "other" factors. It is significant to note that 40 percent of the counselors and only 32 percent of the liberal arts instructors disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Also, 42 percent of the youngest and only 31 percent of the oldest faculty members disagreed. Finally, 28 percent of the "Rural" faculty, 31 percent of the Urban faculty, and 38 percent of the Suburban faculty disagreed.

There seemed to be substantial agreement in Item 7 that disadvantaged students are not generally aware of the "ground rules" for success in college. It is somewhat surprising that so few measures are taken in the junior colleges to assist those students to learn those "ground rules." The usual orientation courses offered to all students can hardly be considered effective compensatory measures.

All those interviewed during the study were asked whether they would favor a guaranteed subsistence grant for disadvantaged students. There seemed to be substantial agreement that such grants were desirable but many of those interviewed indicated that disadvantaged students ought to be required to do some work which would demonstrate their commitment to education and would insure that they valued the opportunity presented to them. Item 8 indicates that 52 percent of the faculty agreed with this point of view. Forty-two percent of the counselors, 53 percent of liberal art instructors, and 70 percent of physical education instructors agreed with the statement in Item 8.

One of the most sacred beliefs held by counselors in junior colleges is that students should not be "placed" in a program. The corollary is that students should be permitted to enter any course or program for which they qualify. However, in practice, counselors exhibit little reluctance to "place" students, including many disadvantaged students, in compulsory remedial subjects or programs. Item 9 indicates that almost 60 percent of the faculty disagreed with the statement that students whose entrance test scores are low should be placed in vocational programs. Seventy-six percent of the counselors but only 49 percent of liberal arts instructors disagreed. Surprisingly, only 59 percent of instructors in semi-professional and vocational courses disagreed.

Item 10 provides an excellent illustration of the conflicting perceptions held by the faculty of the culture of the disadvantaged. Almost equal numbers agreed and disagreed with the statement. The need for inservice programs focused upon an understanding of minority cultures is indicated. Item 19 indicates that 91 percent of the faculty agree that such programs should be provided for instructors engaged in teaching disadvantaged students. It is doubtful that a similar percentage would agree that such programs would be desirable for all instructors.

The administrators interviewed were almost unanimous in the belief that additional funds would have to be provided if the junior college is to develop effective programs for disadvantaged students. The urban colleges which enrolled large numbers of such students seem to experience the most critical financial need. Item 11 indicates that 76 percent of the faculty agreed that additional funds would be required if the problem of the education of disadvantaged students is to be solved. Obviously, additional funds are necessary. However, there are many things which can be done and are being done in several colleges within the limitations of current funding. The important point is that administrators and faculty cannot afford to wait until additional funding is available--the problem of inequality of educational opportunity is present now. That problem has been present for many years and will persist unless something is done now.

Although 82 percent of the faculty disagreed with the statement in Item 13, it is nevertheless true that some compensatory or remedial programs appear to be designed to substitute the majority culture for the disadvantaged minority student's own culture. There seems to be general agreement that such substitution should be avoided and that educators should learn to understand, appreciate, and value minority cultures and should demonstrate their understanding and appreciation to minority group students. Item 17 indicates that 63 percent of the faculty disagreed with the statement that it is appropriate to use middle-class values in formulating goals for and content of special courses for disadvantaged students. It is significant that 72 percent of the counselors but only 57 percent of the liberal arts instructors disagreed with this statement.

The literature indicates that there are significant differences in achievement motivation among various socio-economic groups and that there is very little reason to believe that such differences exist among the various racial or ethnic groups when socio-economic status is controlled; that is, differences in achievement motivation result from socio-economic status rather than racial-group membership. Only 28 percent of the faculty agreed with the statement in Item 14. Reflecting upon the responses to Items 6 and 14, one receives the impression that the perception that many educators hold of members of minority groups are considerably affected by stereotypes.

Opinion about Item 16 seems to be almost evenly divided. Perhaps a more important question would be which four-year college standards and requirements prevent junior colleges from meeting the needs of disadvantaged students and how can they be changed to assist junior colleges in attacking the problem of inequality of educational opportunity. Certainly, the need for cooperation between all segments of higher education is indicated.

One of the characteristics of disadvantaged students noted in the review of the literature was that they are most highly motivated to learn if they are able to experience immediate and concrete rewards. Item 21 indicates that 80 percent of the faculty believe that junior college courses can be taught in a way that makes it possible for disadvantaged students to see such rewards. On the other hand, the responses to Item 24 show that 49 percent of the faculty agreed, and only 24 percent disagreed, that disadvantaged students find that required courses are of little relevance to them in terms of their needs, interests, or concerns. It seems likely that if students can see immediate and concrete rewards as a result of instruction, the subject matter presented would be relevant to them. Evidently, the instruction and the subject matter presented to disadvantaged students could be made far more relevant and rewarding if instructors were interested in doing so.

There seems to be an increasing amount of doubt about the effectiveness of traditional remedial courses. However, the responses to Items 22 and 23 indicate that about one-half of the faculty feel that remedial courses are effective in increasing student achievement and in preparing students for transfer courses. Nevertheless, there appears to be sufficient doubt about the effectiveness of remedial courses to warrant the initiation of a thorough, evaluative study. A similar conclusion could be drawn from the response to Item 27 concerning the heterogeneous grouping of students.

It has already been pointed out that in Item 29 approximately 60 percent of the faculty are aware that there are large numbers of disadvantaged high school graduates in the community who are not attending junior college. However, almost one-third of the faculty apparently had no opinion, or no information, about this condition and 9 percent disagreed that the condition existed. Evidently there is a need for junior colleges to conduct community surveys designed to determine the number of students who are not being served as well as the reasons why those students are not enrolled in the college. Such a survey should be followed by an active program of recruiting.

Since one of the major objectives of this study is to determine what the role of the junior college should be in the education of disadvantaged students, all administrators were asked whether the junior college or some other institution ought to be primarily responsible for that function. The almost unanimous response was that the junior college was the institution best equipped to perform the function and that it must accept the primary responsibility for fulfilling it. Item 26 indicates that this opinion was not so strongly held by the faculty. Approximately two-thirds of the faculty agreed with the statement, with 62 percent of the liberal arts instructors and 76 percent of the counselors disagreeing. It seems clear that a large majority of administrators, counselors, and instructors agreed that the junior college must play the major role in the education of disadvantaged students.

Although the response to Item 30 indicates that 77 percent of the faculty disagree that special programs for disadvantaged students are just another method of preserving de facto segregation, the fact is that such classes often appear to be segregated classes. There is no doubt that the faculty recognize this problem but are saying that special classes are not established for the purpose of segregating students. Nevertheless, it is especially important to recognize that disadvantaged students may well feel that they are being forced into classes which do separate them from the regular students in the college. It is essential, therefore, that disadvantaged students have many opportunities to enter the mainstream of the college in order to compensate for any feeling of segregation they might feel in special classes.

In summary, it might reasonably be stated that the responses to the faculty questionnaire indicate that most of the faculty could profit from a program of in-service training focused upon the characteristics, needs, and problems of disadvantaged students and on effective measures for increasing their achievement. Such in-service training programs should include study and discussion leading to an understanding and appreciation of minority cultures. Basic encounter groups which include members of majority and minority groups might prove to be useful adjuncts to in-service training.

In general, counselors appear to have a more thorough understanding of, and a more sympathetic approach to the problem of educating disadvantaged students than the instructors. There should be a higher degree of cooperation between instructors and counselors in planning courses or programs for disadvantaged students.

All of the evidence obtained in this study indicates that the faculty of the California junior colleges has not developed a genuine commitment to solving the problem of inequality of educational opportunity.

SECTION V - CONCLUSIONS

1. Although it is generally recognized by the administrators, counselors, and instructors in California's junior colleges that these institutions enroll a much larger proportion of disadvantaged students than the other California institutions of higher education; and although there is general agreement that the junior colleges of California must accept the major role in the education of those students, and that the junior colleges are the institutions of higher education best equipped to perform that function, only minimal special efforts are being made to provide the educational experiences which would help disadvantaged students to overcome the effects of discrimination and deprivation.

2. During the course of this study it has been possible to identify only a few innovative and imaginative programs for disadvantaged students and these programs are the work of a few dedicated individuals in a few colleges.

3. There is a large and increasing volume of information concerned with the characteristics, needs, and problems of disadvantaged students and with methods and techniques which seem to have promise of increasing the achievement of such students. In general, educators demonstrate only a limited familiarity with, and understanding of such information. There appears to be little effort to raise that level of familiarity and understanding. Very few junior colleges have established informal or formal in-service training programs for instructors involved in special programs for disadvantaged students or for the administrators and faculty as a whole.

4. Only a few junior colleges make any attempt to identify disadvantaged students either before they enroll or after they have enrolled.

5. Most junior college appear to rely on remedial courses or programs to satisfy the special and particular needs of disadvantaged students. In many cases disadvantaged students are enrolled in compulsory remedial courses or programs designed only to meet the needs of low ability students. Very little evaluative research has been conducted to assess the effectiveness of such courses or programs with respect to increasing the achievement of disadvantaged students.

6. Since disadvantaged students experience a "cumulative deficit" in achievement in the elementary and secondary schools, the junior college faces a most difficult task in providing effective compensatory programs and services.

7. Although it is generally recognized by both administrators and faculty that many disadvantaged students of college age are not enrolling in the community junior college, or any college, only a few recruitment programs have been established.

8. In the absence of evaluative research by the colleges it is not possible at this time to identify programs which are effective in increasing the achievement of disadvantaged students. Therefore, it is also not possible to describe a model program which might be adopted by any junior college. Furthermore, since (on a empirical basis) most of the programs which appeared to be promising were those which were designed to meet the specific needs of the disadvantaged students who were enrolled in a given college, it is probably not desirable to think in terms of a model program.

9. Three major approaches to providing the necessary educational experiences for disadvantaged students have been identified.

    1. A required series of remedial courses.
    2. A special services program.
    3. An effort to revise existing educational policies and practices, materials, and subject matter.

10. There appears to be little agreement among administrators and faculty about what the goals of a program for disadvantaged students should be.

11. Most of the programs for disadvantaged students have been initiated by administrators. Although there is a growing awareness among the faculty of the needs of disadvantaged students, the evidence from this study indicates that the majority of faculty members of California's junior colleges are not generally concerned about providing equal educational opportunities for disadvantaged students.

12. Individual tutoring by students appears to be a promising method of assisting disadvantaged students to overcome academic deficiencies.

13. The disadvantaged and the not-disadvantaged students who completed the Student Questionnaire appear to be m much more alike than different with respect to aspirations, programs, and sources of help.

14. The most pressing problem of most disadvantaged students is obtaining enough money to go to college. Probably the second most pressing problem is finding enough time to study.

15. Except for the Work-Study program, only a small proportion of the limited amount of available financial aid is being allocated to disadvantaged students.

16. The disadvantaged students who completed the Student Questionnaire:

    a. Appeared to be serious about going to college but not much interested in student activities or athletics.
    b. Did not feel that the counselors and instructors were helpful to them in solving their problems. The most frequently mentioned source of help was "a friend."
    c. Appeared to like college and seemed to appreciate any special efforts the college made for them.

17. Instructors and counselors who completed the Faculty Questionnaire assigned the highest educational value for disadvantaged students to: special remedial-level courses, special help in securing part-time jobs, and additional counseling. The lowest value was assigned to: taking college offerings out into the community, the identification of disadvantaged students, and programs of active recruitment.

18. Junior colleges have not been aggressive in securing funds for financial aid for disadvantaged students who often do not meet traditional scholarship requirements.

19. It was reported by several minority group junior college personnel that disadvantaged students, in general, fear the college and are especially concerned about the testing and registration procedures.

20. Although junior colleges charge no tuition fee, disadvantaged students encounter significant financial barriers. Estimates of the cost of maintaining the student in the home ranged from $1,000 to $1,400. Especially in Mexican-American families, students are frequently expected to augment family income rather than continue their education beyond the secondary school.

21. The great majority of the students who completed the Student Questionnaire are using either their parents' money or their own money to pay their expenses while attending college.

22. Junior colleges do not have sufficient scholarship, loan, or work-study funds. The majority of junior college personnel would favor some form of direct financial assistance for disadvantaged students.

23. There are very few minority group administrators, counselors or instructors employed in junior colleges, but there is a growing recognition of the need for such personnel.

24. Except for some evening programs, the community colleges have not brought the community into the college nor have they taken the college offerings out into the community.

25. In the efforts to provide special services or programs for disadvantaged students, there has been little articulation and cooperation with other segments of education.

26. Most administrators and faculty members feel that additional funding for special programs or services is essential if equality of educational opportunity is to be realized. However, some colleges have demonstrated that programs and services can be provided within the limits of present funding. Those junior colleges which enrolled the largest numbers of disadvantaged students seemed to face the most critical financial problems.

27. Unless they begin immediately to take action to provide educational experiences which will help disadvantaged students to overcome the effects of discrimination and deprivation, the colleges will be subjected to an increasing amount of pressure from militant minority groups.

SECTION VI - RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges:

1. Express its conviction that the California community colleges must accept the major role in the education of disadvantaged students at the post-secondary level.

2. Accept a leadership role in encouraging and assisting community colleges to develop programs designed to satisfy the special needs of disadvantaged students.

3. Accept the responsibility for securing additional funds for community colleges which serve a large number of disadvantaged students.

4. Accept the responsibility for securing additional funding for all community colleges which are attempting to support instructional programs, financial aids, individual student tutoring, additional counseling, and other services for disadvantaged students.

5. Provide the assistance of consultants to any community college which plans to conduct a program of in-service training concerned with the characteristics, needs, and problems of disadvantaged students and with effective methods for increasing the achievement of such students.

6. Request that a community college's program for disadvantaged students be a topic for investigation by accreditation teams.

7. Move as quickly as possible to provide regulations which will permit individual commuity colleges to establish far more flexible standards for retention, probation, and graduation, appropriate to the needs of the students it services.

8. Encourage all community colleges to adopt a positive program for the recruitment of minority group administrators, counselors, and instructors; and through revisions of the credentialing regulations make it possible for colleges to employ any of such personnel, who might be under-qualified, in an internship capacity.

It is recommended that each California community college assume the responsibility for:

1. Recruiting and employing staff members who are both knowledgeable about, and committed to satisfying the needs of disadvantaged students.

2. Recruiting and employing a significant number of minority-group administrators, counselors, and instructors. If necessary, in-service training or internships should be established for personnel who might be under-qualified according to traditional standards.

3. Provide substantial in-service training for all staff, especially those instructors and counselors involved in programs for disadvantaged students.

4. Developing, as a college-wide effort, a comprehensive program designed to satisfy the needs of disadvantaged students.

5. Determining by a community survey the number of disadvantaged students of college age (including adults) who are not attending college.

6. Establishing an active program of recruitment which will be effective in attracting disadvantaged students to the community college.

7. Establishing formal measures for beginning recruitment procedures for disadvantaged students enrolled in feeder high schools and in the junior high schools, if necessary.

8. Establishing formal procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the college's program for disadvantaged students in terms of the goals which have been formulated.

9. Involving the community, particularly the disadvantaged community, in the affairs of the college through the use of special workships; forums; cultural, social, and recreational activities; and instructional programs which satisfy the needs of the community as they are perceived by the members of the community. Establishing an advisory committee of disadvantaged youth and adults may be helpful.

10. Taking many of the college offerings out into the disadvantaged community.

11. Simplifying registration and class enrollment procedures.

12. Establishing a cooperative working relationship with employers in the public and private sectors for the purpose of providing meaningful employment for students--not only during the college year but more importantly, during vacation periods.

13. Seeking from business and industry larger amounts of scholarship and loan funds for disadvantaged students who may not meet the traditional scholarship requirements.

14. Establishing a community-wide advisory group of citizens and students who can make suggestions to the college for necessary and appropriate changes in curriculum and in the counseling program.

15. Investigating with business and industry the values and advantages of a cooperative education program--especially in terms of how such a program might be of assistance to disadvantaged students.

16. Increasing opportunities for disadvantaged students in vocational education and making such students aware of those opportunities.

17. Eradicating the last vestiges of discriminatory practices with regard to entrance into apprenticeship programs.

18. Involving disadvantaged students in all phases of college life and, in every way possible, creating for them a supportive college environment.

19. Designating as a major effort and an important function of the college the accomplishment of the equality of educational opportunity for all students.

20. Re-evaluating the usefulness of and the effect on disadvantaged students of the following:

    a. standardized tests and standardized test scores.
    b. traditional letter grading.
    c. tracking by ability level.
    d. course prerequisities.
    e. traditional remedial courses.
    f. the middle-class value structure underlying many courses.
    g. the counseling program.
    h. course content in terms of it relevance as perceived by disadvantaged students.
    i. college and course withdrawal deadlines.
    j. traditional instructional methods and techniques.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clark, K. B. Dark Ghetto. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Clark, K. B. The Invisible Wall. In Lewis B. Mayhew, Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1927, 19-27.

Coleman, J. S. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: U.S. Government Printing, 1966.

Dennis, J. E. Equalizing Educational Opportunity for the Disadvantaged. In Lewis B. Mayhew, Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1967, 297-304.

Dyer, H. S. School Factors and Equal Educational Opportunity, Harvard Educational Review. 1968, Vol. 38 (No. 1) 38-56.

Fischer, J. H. Race and Reconciliation: The Role of the School. In Talcott Parsons and Kenneth B. Clark, The Negro American. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966, 491-511.

Forbes, J. D. Mexican-Americans. Berkeley: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1966.

Goldberg, M. L., Passow, A. H. & Justman, J. The Effects of Ability Grouping. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Gonzales, R. La Raza. Los Angeles: 1968, Vol. 1 (No. 14).

Gordon, E. W., Wilkerson, D. A. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged, College Entrance Examination Board. New York: 1966.

Havighurst, R. J. Who are the Socially Disadvantaged? In J. L. Frost and G. R. Hawkes, The Disadvantaged Child. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966, 15-23.

Jenks, C. Social Stratification and Higher Education, Harvard Educational Review. 1968, Vol. 38 (No. 2) 277-316.

Katz, I. Academic Motivation and Equal Educational Opportunity, Harvard Educational Review. 1968, Vol. 38 (No. 1) 57-65.

Kemp, B. H. The Youth We Haven't Served. Washington: U.S. Government Printing, 1966.

Moynihan, D. P. Sources of Resistance to the Coleman Report, Harvard Educational Review. 1968, Vol. 38 (No. 1) 23-36.

Racial and Ethnic Survey of California Public Schools, Office of Compensatory Education, California Department of Education, Sacramento: 1967.

Riessman, F. The Overlooked Positives of Disadvantaged Groups. In J. L. Frost and G. R. Hawkes, The Disadvantaged Child. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966, 51-57.

Rosenthal, R., Jacobsen, L. F. Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged, Scientific American. 1968, Vol. 218 (No. 4) 19-23.

Rouche, J. E. Salvage, Redirection or Custody. Los Angeles: American Association of Junior Colleges, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1968.

Sanders, J. E., Palmer, H. C. The Financial Barrier to Higher Education in California. Claremont: Pomona College, 1965.

Stodolsky, S., Lesser, G. Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged, Harvard Educational Review. 1967, Vol. 37 (No. 4) 546-593.

Walton, S. F., Jr. The Black Curriculum. Oakland: Eatmon Press, 1968.

Wicker, T. Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

Wilson, A. B., Jensen, A. R. and Elliott, D. L. Education of Disadvantaged Children in California. Berkeley: University of California, 1966.

Wilson, A. B. Educational Consequences of Segregation in a California Community. Berkeley: Survey Research Center, University of California, 1966.

Appendix A
Preliminary Question Form and Covering Letter

The Peralta Colleges
300 GRAND AVENUE • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94610 • TELEPHONE (415) 834-5500

John W. Dunn • Superintendent
Clement A. Long • Asst. Superintendent

September 1, 1967

Dear ____________________:

At the request of the State Board of Education the Peralta Junior College District will conduct a study of special programs for culturally or socio-economically disadvantaged students in California institutions of higher education. I have been designated as director of the study and I will be assisted by Dr. Dayton Axtell of Merritt College.

The objectives of this study are to study the educational needs of disadvantaged students, to identify creative and effective programs for disadvantaged students, to suggest other possible approaches to the problem of providing adequate educational programs for such students, and to suggest means by which special programs could be financed.

This initial letter is a part of the planning phase, in which we need to know where special programs for the disadvantaged exist. We feel that brief answers to a few preliminary questions will provide us the information needed to plan further. Needless to say, we will welcome any other information or comments, or any suggestions you may have about the study.

Although we are not now concerned with complete precision in the definition of terms, we are thinking of the disadvantaged student as one who, through lack of adequate background experiences, seems very unlikely to succeed in the regular program offerings in higher education. Within this framework, would you please answer the questions on the enclosed sheet.

Since the study is to be completed and presented to the State Board by June 30, 1968, we would very much appreciate having your answers to these preliminary questions as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Ernest H. Berg
Director of Educational Services

EHB:ps
Enclosure

Appendix A (Cont'd.)

PERALTA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT
Study of Programs in California Higher Education
for the Culturally Disadvantaged Student

Preliminary Question Form

Although we recognize that many junior colleges have not had sufficient time in which to plan programs for the disadvantaged and that many colleges are handicapped by lack of funds and facilities, in terms of the definition of the disadvantaged student suggested in the accompanying letter, please respond to the following questions:

1. Would you please estimate the percentage of your students who would be considered disadvantaged?

______ None
______ 0 - 10%
______ 11 - 20%
______ 21 - 30%
______ 31 - 40%
______ 41 - 50%
______ Over 50%

2. Are these students predominantly

______ Negro
______ Mexican-American
______ Caucasian

3. How do you provide for the special educational needs of the disadvantaged students?

______ in the regular instructional program
______ in a special instructional program

4. Do you provide special counseling services for disadvantaged students?

______ regular services only
______ additional individual counseling
______ additional group counseling

5. What other special services do you provide for disadvantaged students?

______ scholarships
______ loans
______ work-study program
______ medical services
______ additional orientation
______ other

6. Does your college attempt to recruit disadvantaged students who would otherwise not attend college?

______ yes
______ no

7. Would you please state briefly your concept of the role of the junior college with regard to the needs of disadvantaged students.

____
Name

____
Title

____
Institution

Appendix B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This set of questions is a part of a study being made in several junior colleges in California. The study is to find out about programs to meet special needs that students sometimes have in college. For this, it is important to find out some things about students and about their feelings about these programs.

The information students themselves can give us is one of the most important parts of the study. We hope that this study will result in improving college programs to meet students' real needs. Therefore, please answer the questions thoughtfully, and as you really feel. You will notice that your name is not asked for. Your answers will be used only in our study center in Oakland, and no one will know who they came from.

Although there are several pages, you will find that these questions will not take very long to answer. The numbers in parentheses ( ) are for use in putting the answers on IBM cards. You do not need to pay any attention to these numbers. Please feel free to come up to ask us about anything that is not clear. Thank you for your help.

Please fill in the name of this college ____

1. Many students find that college is different from high school in one or more ways. In each question below, will you please check the way you feel.

As compared with high school, college is:
(8-1) __ Harder
(8-2) __ About the same difficulty
(8-3) __ Easier

Money is:
(9-1) __ More of a problem now than in high school
(9-2) __ No more of a problem than in high school
(9-3) __ Less of a problem than in high school

Transportation is:
(10-1) __ More of a problem now than in high school
(10-2) __ No more of a problem than in high school
(10-3) __ Less of a problem than in high school

In regard to time for studying:
(11-1) __ I have more time now than in high school
(11-2) __ Things are about the same as in high school
(11-3) __ I have less time now than in high school

As compared to my high school teachers, my teachers here:
(12-1) __ Take more personal interest in me
(12-2) __ Take about the same personal interest in me
(12-3) __ Take less personal interest in me

As compared to my high school counselor, my counselor here:
(13-1) __ Takes more personal interest in me
(13-2) __ Takes about the same personal interest in me
(13-3) __ Takes less personal interest in me

At college here I have:
(14-1) __ More friends than in high school
(14-2) __ About the same number of friends as in high school
(14-3) __ Fewer friends than in high school

As compared with high school, I feel:
(15-1) __ More alone
(15-2) __ About the same as I did
(15-3) __ More a member of a group

Are there any other ways that college is different from high school for you? If so, please write them here: ______________________________
(16-) (17-) ______________________________

2. Students often find that college is different from the way they thought it would be before coming. Please check as many of the following as are true for you.

(18-1) __ Harder than I thought it would be
(18-2) __ Easier than I thought it would be

(19-1) __ More expensive than I thought
(19-2) __ Less expensive than I thought

(20-1) __ Transportation to here is harder than I thought
(20-2) __ Transportation to here is easier than I thought

(21-1) __ I have more time for study than I thought I would have
(21-2) __ I have less time for study than I thought I would have

(22-1) __ Teachers take more personal interest in me than I had thought
(22-2) __ Teachers take less personal interest in me than I had thought

(23-1) __ Counselors take more personal interest in me than I had thought
(23-2) __ Counselors take less personal interest in me than I had thought

(24-1) __ I have more friends here than I thought I would have
(24-2) __ I have fewer friends here than I thought I would have

(25-1) __ I am more "on my own" than I expected to be
(25-2) __ I am more "looked after" than I expected to be
(26-1) __ I am more alone than I had expected to be
(26-2) __ I am more a member of a group than I had expected to be

Are there any other ways that college is different from the way you thought it would be? If so, please write them here: ______________________________
(27-) (28-) ______________________________

3. Why did you come to college? Please check as many of the following that are true for you.

(29-1) __ Get training for a job
(30-1) __ My parent(s) wanted me to
(31-1) __ For the social life
(32-1) __ For the athletics
(33-1) __ There was really not much else to do
(34-1) __ So I could apply for a student draft deferment
(35-1) __ To get a basic general education and appreciation
(36-1) __ To learn more about people
(37-1) __ To learn more about community and world problems
(38-1) __ To develop moral and ethical standards
(39-1) __ To be with my friends
(40-1) __ To meet people of same sex
(41-1) __ To meet people of the opposite sex
(42-1) __ To develop talents and creative abilities
(43-1) __ To take part in student government or activities
(44-1) __ The prestige of "being in college"
(45-1) __ Because someone else urged me to. Please state this person's position (friend, counselor, parent, etc.) ______________
(46-) ______________

(47-) __ Other reason (Please indicate what it is: __
(48-) ______________________)

4. The following are some of the reasons students give for liking college. If any of these are true for you, please check as many as are true.

(49-1) __ Interesting classes
(50-1) __ Friends of my own sex
(51-1) __ Friends of the opposite sex
(52-1) __ The social life
(53-1) __ The feeling I am "getting somewhere"
(54-1) __ The athletic program
(55-1) __ Contacts with the faculty
(56-1) __ Contacts with the counselor(s)
(57-1) __ The student government
(58-1) __ Because it gives one a chance for artistic and creative expression
(59-1) __ Contacts with other students
(60-1) __ Student clubs and activities
(61-1) __ Discussions
(62-1) __ Being away from home
(63-1) __ Being "on my own"
(64-1) __ I am "discovering" myself
(65-1) __ Living with other students
(66-1) __ Other (please indicate what it is: ______
____
(67-) (68-) ______________________)

5. The following are some of the reasons students give for not liking college. Please check any that are true for you. You may check any items you wish here, even if you have checked some of the items in question 4.

(69-1) __ Too hard
(70-1) __ Too impersonal
(71-1) __ I feel alone
(72-1) __ I do not have a satisfactory social life
(73-1) __ I do not feel I am "getting anywhere"
(74-1) __ I do not like being away from home
(75-1) __ Classes generally do not interest me
(76-1) __ Too much pressure
(77-1) __ Not enough time to do the academic work
(78-1) __ Not enough friends of my own sex
(79-1) __ Not enough friends of the opposite sex
(80-1) __ Health is not good (mental health or physical health)
(8-1) __ Not enough money
(9-1) __ I am different from most of the rest of the students here
(10-1) __ I am left too much on my own
(11-1) __ Housing conditions are not pleasant
(12-1) __ Other: (Please indicate what it is: _____
______________________)

6. On the whole, which of the following is true for you?

(13-1) __ I like it here more than I dislike it
(13-2) __ I dislike it here more than I like it

6a Do you feel that your home background (newspapers, books, magazines, games) prepared you as well for school work as most of the students here?

(14-1) __ Yes
(14-2) __ No

7. At this point, what are your plans for the next four years? Put X's in any of the boxes that apply.

	This Year	Next Year	3rd Year	4th Year
Be working	(15-1)	(16-1)	(17-1)	(18-1)
Be in the military	(19-1)	(20-1)	(21-1)	(22-1)
Be married	(23-1)	(24-1)	(25-1)	(26-1)
Be in college	(27-1)	(28-1)	(29-1)	(30-1)
Other: please state what ____________				

Appendix B (Cont'd.)

8. (43-) (44-) What is your age? ____________________

9. What kind of a career are you thinking about for yourself? Please check only one.

(45-12) __ Military career
(45-11) __ Owner of my own business
(45-0) __ Business (administration)
(45-1) __ Business (bookkeeping, secretarial, etc.)
(45-2) __ Sales
(45-3) __ Doctor or dentist
(45-4) __ Nurse
(45-5) __ Other Medical (X-ray, technician, etc.)
(45-6) __ Lawyer
(45-7) __ Minister, priest, rabbi
(45-8) __ Scientific research work
(45-9) __ College teaching
(46-12) __ High school teaching
(46-11) __ Elementary school teaching
(46-0) __ Artist, musician, actor, etc.
(46-1) __ Social worker
(46-2) __ Technical (electronics, drafting, IBM, cosmetology, etc.)
(46-3) __ Farming
(46-4) __ Forestry or conservation
(46-5) __ Government (civil service)
(46-6) __ Homemaking
(47-) __ Other (Please indicate what: ____________
(48-) __ ____________________________)
(49-1) __ I really do not have any idea now.

10. Some colleges offer special programs to meet special needs students sometimes have. Would you please check any of the following that you know are provided at this college.

(50-1) __ Special classes
(51-1) __ Special counseling
(52-1) __ Special tutoring
(53-1) __ Special financial assistance
(54-1) __ Special help with getting jobs
(55-1) __ Special help with transportation
(56-) __ Other special program. (Please state what it is: ____________________________)

11. If you are in any of these programs, would you please indicate how helpful they are
&
12. to you by putting X's where they apply.

	Very helpful to me (-1)	Somewhat helpful to me (-2)	Not very helpful to me (-3)	No help to me (-4)
(58-) Special classes				
(59-) Special counseling				
(60-) Special tutoring				
(61-) Special financial assistance				
(62-) Special help with getting jobs				
(63-) Special help with transportation				
(64-) Other special programs				
(65-) Please state what it is: ____________				

13. If any of these programs that you are in could be more helpful to you, would you please briefly state how: (66-) (67-) ____________________
____
____

14. Have there been any changes in your plans for the next few years, or in your career plans, as a result of any experience or special programs here at college?

(68-1) _____ Yes (68-2) _____ No

14a If any individual was important in causing the changes in your plans, please indicate who it was, by stating his or her position. (For example, instructor in history, Dean, classmate, etc.)

(69-) ____________________________________

15. Has anything else about you changed as a result of any experiences or special programs here at college?

(70-1) __ Yes (If you check "yes", please fill in the blanks below. It does not matter if the handwriting or grammar are not perfect. If you do not wish to give this information, it is perfectly all right to leave this part out.)

(70-2) __ No

(71-) (72-) The following (has) (have) changed: ______
____
____

(73-) (74-) This was because: ______________
____
____

Appendix B (Cont'd.)

15a If any individual was important in causing this change in you, please indicate who it was by stating his or her position.

(75-) ______________________________

16. Are there any things that are real needs or problems for you personally at this point? Would you please think about this for a few minutes, and then check only those that really "get" you.

(76-1) ___ Need more money
(77-1) ___ Need more time for study
(78-1) ___ Poor health
(79-1) ___ Feeling alone
(80-1) ___ Mixed up about myself
(8-1) ___ Mixed up about goals and plans
(9-1) ___ Need help with course work
(10-1) ___ Need help straightening myself out
(11-1) ___ Need to get over insecurity or shyness
(12-1) ___ Deciding what to do about the draft
(13-1) ___ Deciding what to do about a realtionship(s) with another person or persons
(14-1) ___ Inability to express myself in words
(15-) ___ Other (Please describe briefly: ________)

17. Is anything or anyone here at college helping you to meet any of these needs or solve any of the problems? Check any that are helping or who have helped.

(17-1) ___ One friend
(18-1) ___ Friends
(19-1) ___ Family member here at college
(20-1) ___ Faculty member
(21-1) ___ Dean
(22-1) ___ Counselor
(23-1) ___ Tutor
(24-1) ___ Course or courses (Please say what they
(25-) are: ______________________________)
(26-1) ___ Job placement office
(27-1) ___ Doctor or nurse here at college
(28-1) ___ My own efforts
(29-1) ___ Clubs or groups
(30-1) ___ Religious worker (minister, priest, etc.)
(31-1) ___ Financial aids office or counselor
(32-) ___ Other (Please state who or what: ________
______________________________)

18. How could this college be more helpful to you? Please state the thing or things that you think would be most important to you personally. Feel free to suggest any ideas, even if they seem very "far out".

____
(34-) (35-) ______________________________

18a Do you think it is best for students who need special academic help:

(36-1) ___ to take a special program of classes designed to provide this help
or
(36-2) ___ to take the regular classes, with an opportunity to get extra individual help

19. Do you feel that the instructors you have had care about you as an individual? Please put X's in any boxes that apply.

	Several	2 or 3	One	None
(37-) Really care				
(38-) Care some				
(39-) Do not seem to care				
	(-1)	(-2)	(-3)	(-4)

19a Have you had any interviews with any of the counselors?

(40-1) ___ Yes (If you check "yes" please answer question 19b and 19c)

(40-2) ___ No (If you check "no" skip question 19b and 19c and go on to question 20)

19b Which of the following most closely describes your feeling about the counseling service you have had?

(41-1) ___ Very helpful to me
(41-2) ___ Somewhat helpful to me
(41-3) ___ Not very helpful to me
(41-4) ___ No help to me

19c In regard to the counselor you have talked with most, which applies?

(42-1) ___ He (or she) is really concerned about me as an individual
(42-2) ___ He (or she) is somewhat concerned about me as an individual
(42-3) ___ He (or she) does not seem concerned about me as an individual

Appendix B (Cont'd.)

20. Which of the following best describes your high school program?

(43-1) __ Business
(43-2) __ Liberal Arts
(43-3) __ College-prep
(43-4) __ Trade
(43-5) __ Vocational
(43-) __ Other (What was it: ____________________)

20a About what was your over-all grade average for high school?

(44-12) __ A	(44-2) __ B-	(44-6) __ D+
(44-11) __ A-	(44-3) __ C+	(44-7) __ D
(44-0) __ B+	(44-4) __ C	(44-8) __ D-
(44-1) __ B	(44-5) __ C-	(44-9) __ F

21. Did you graduate from high school?

(45-1) _____ Yes (45-2) _____ No

22. Did you come to this college directly from high school?

(46-1) __ Yes (If you check "yes" skip question 23 and go to question 24)
(46-2) __ No (If you check "no" answer question 23, then go on to question 24)

23. What have you been spending most of your time doing since high school and before coming here? Please check only one.

(47-1) __ Working
(48-1) __ In military service
(49-1) __ Homemaking
(50-1) __ Going to another school
(51-1) __ Not anything, really
(52-) __ Other (Please state what: ______________)

24. How long have you been here at this college now?

(53-1) __ One semester (or quarter)
(53-2) __ Two semesters (or quarters)
(53-3) __ One year or more
(53-4) __ Two years or more

25. What courses are you taking right now? (You may not remember all the specific names or numbers. Fill in as much as you can.)

	Title of Course	Department	Course Number
(54-)			
(55-)			
(56-)			
(57-)			
(58-)			
(59-)			

26. How many units (total) are you taking right now?
(60-) (61-) ____________________

27. How does your family feel about your coming to college here?

(62-1) __ Urged me to come
(62-2) __ In favor of it
(62-3) __ Kind of neutral
(62-4) __ Kind of against it
(62-5) __ Very much against it
(62-6) __ I'm not sure

28. & 29. How far did your parents go in school? If you are not sure, estimate if you can.

Father	Mother	
(63-0) __	(64-0) __	8th grade or less
(63-1) __	(64-1) __	Some high school
(63-2) __	(64-2) __	High school graduate
(63-3) __	(64-3) __	Special work beyond high school (business school, technical school, etc.)
(63-4) __	(64-4) __	Some college
(63-5) __	(64-5) __	Junior college graduate
(63-6) __	(64-6) __	Graduate of a four-year college
(63-7) __	(64-7) __	Post-graduate work
(63-8) __	(64-8) __	Other (Please say what it was: ____________________)
(63-9) __	(64-9) __	I simply do not know

30. & 31. Where do you get the money for college? Please put X's in any of the boxes that apply.

	Books, other college supplies and transportation	Living costs (board, room and clothes)
Parents money	(65-1)	(66-1)
Money from a job I have	(67-1)	(68-1)
Economic grant through the college	(69-1)	(70-1)
Scholarship money	(71-1)	(72-1)
G. I. Bill	(73-1)	(74-1)
Loan	(75-1)	(76-1)
My savings	(77-1)	(78-1)
My wife's or my husband's earnings	(79-1)	(80-1)
Other: Please state	(8-1) (9-1)	(10-1) (11-1)

Appendix B (Cont'd.)

32. Is money a problem for you?

(12-1) __ A very serious problem
(12-2) __ Yes, most of the time
(12-3) __ Not often
(12-4) __ No problem

33. If you have a job, how many hours per week do you work?

(13-1) __ 40 or more
(13-2) __ 30 to 39
(13-3) __ 20 to 29
(13-4) __ 10 to 19
(13-5) __ Less than 10
(13-6) __ I am not now working

34. Sex

(14-1) _____ Male
(14-2) _____ Female

35. Racial Background:

(15-1) __ Afro-American
(15-2) __ American Indian
(15-3) __ Caucasian
(15-4) __ Japanese-American
(15-5) __ Mexican-American
(15-6) __ Other (Please indicate what:
(16-) ____)

36. When you were growing up, what was the main source of income for your family?

(17-1) __ Father's job
(17-2) __ Mother's job
(17-3) __ Other person's job (Please state what relation to you: ________________(18-)

37. If the main source of income checked in question 36 was someone's job, would you please write down what kind of a job this was--that is, what did he or she actually do.

(19-) (20-) ____________________________________

38. When you were growing up, was this income generally--

(21-1) __ More than $4,000 a year
(21-2) __ Less than $4,000 a year

39. Do you receive a daily newspaper in your home?

(22-1) __ Yes
(22-2) __ No

40. Check below the approximate number of books in your home.

(23-1) __ 0-9
(23-2) __ 10-19
(23-3) __ 20-49
(23-4) __ 50-79
(23-5) __ 80-100
(23-6) __ Over 100

Are there any other comments about yourself, or about the college, that you would like to make?

____

____

____
(24-) (25-) (26-) (27-)

*****

THANK YOU VERY, VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Appendix C
Faculty Questionnaire and Covering Letter

The Peralta Colleges
300 GRAND AVENUE • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94610 • TELEPHONE (415) 834-5500

John W. Dunn • Superintendent
Clement A. Long • Asst. Superintendent

April 22, 1968

Dear Colleague:

At the request of the State Board of Education the Peralta Junior College District has undertaken a study of programs for socio-economically disadvantaged students in California junior colleges. The specific objectives of the study are to identify programs which meet the needs of such students, to suggest methods by which such programs could be implemented, and to define the role of the junior college, as one segment of higher education, with respect to the education of such students.

It is widely accepted that the term "socio-economically disadvantaged" defines students coming from low income families, usually living in urban or rural slum areas. Often such students have not had the kind of home and background experiences required to succeed in college. Frequently they are also members of minority groups. In the attached materials we have used the term "disadvantaged" to mean "socio-economically disadvantaged."

Most of the junior colleges which reported special efforts on behalf of disadvantaged students have been visited. Such in-depth visits have included structured interviews with administrators, counselors and faculty members. Over 1,000 student questionnaires have been administered.

We feel that it is of the utmost importance to gain the insight of a larger group of junior college faculty about programs for disadvantaged students. For this reason we have developed the attached questionnaire which has been sent to a randomly selected sample of all the teaching faculty and to all counselors in California junior colleges.

Would you please assist us by completing this questionnaire thoughtfully and promptly and mailing it back, today, in the attached envelope.

Cordially,

Ernest H. Berg
Director of Educational Services

Dayton Axtell
Research Associate

EHB:ps
Enclosures

Appendix C (Cont'd.)
Faculty Questionnaire--Section I

On this questionnaire you are asked to rate each of the items for educational value and for budget priority according to the following categories:

EDUCATIONAL VALUE

1. Essential
2. Highly desirable
3. Desirable
4. Of questionable value
5. Of no value
6. Inappropriate

BUDGET PRIORITY

1. Highest priority
2. High priority
3. Medium priority
4. Low priority
5. Should be considered only if additional state or federal funding is available

EXAMPLE

	EDUCATIONAL VALUE	BUDGET PRIORITY
Medical screening for disadvantaged students to discover problems in diet, eyesight, use of drugs, etc.	2	3

	EDUCATIONAL VALUE	BUDGET PRIORITY	
(1)* 1. Adequate availability of special, remedial level classes for disadvantaged students with weak academic backgrounds			(2)
(3) 2. Adequate availability of individual tutoring for disadvantaged students with weak academic backgrounds			(4)
(5) 3. Availability of additional, special counseling for disadvantaged students			(6)
(7) 4. Active recruitment of disadvantaged students who otherwise would not seek entrance			(8)
(9) 5. Availability of guaranteed financial support to meet minimum needs of disadvantaged students			(10)
(11) 6. Availability of special help for the disadvantaged in securing part-time jobs while enrolled in college			(12)
(13) 7. Employment or assignment of one or two staff members with understanding and commitment to work full-time with disadvantaged students			(14)
(15) 8. Medical screening for disadvantaged students to discover problems in diet, eyesight, use of drugs, etc.			(16)
(17) 9. Taking some of the college offerings out into the disadvantaged community			(18)
(19) 10. Development of ways to better identify those students who are disadvantaged			(20)
(21) 11. Development of special instructional materials for disadvantaged students			(22)

* The numbers in parentheses are for use in key-punching only.

Appendix C (Cont'd.)
Faculty Questionnaire--Section II

For each of the following questions, please write the response which most closely approximates the way you feel.

SA = Strongly agree
A = Agree
? = I have no opinion
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly disagree

---

1. A special instructional program for disadvantaged students is not necessary since the existing curriculum of the junior college is sufficiently broad to meet the educational needs of such students. SA A ? D SD (23)

2. Students whose scores on entrance tests fall into the lowest decile should be placed in a required series of remedial courses. SA A ? D SD (24)

3. Disadvantaged students whose scores on entrance tests fall in the lowest decile should be placed in a required series of remedial courses. SA A ? D SD (25)

4. Such strategies as delayed course or college withdrawal dates and/or non-punitive grading systems ought to be introduced to reduce the possibility of academic failure of disadvantaged students. SA A ? D SD (26)

5. The increasing gap between the achievement of middle class and disadvantaged students as they advance through the grades is a clear indication of the failure of our public school system. SA A ? D SD (27)

6. Measured mean differences in the intelligence of Negroes and whites are caused by the same factors that cause differences in the intelligence of individuals within each group. SA A ? D SD (28)

7. Disadvantaged students are generally aware of the "ground rules" for success in college. SA A ? D SD (29)

8. Rather than give direct financial aid to disadvantaged students they should be required to engage in a "work-study" program because this will insure that they will value their opportunity for a college education. SA A ? D SD (30)

9. Students whose entrance test scores indicate that they are not able to do college work ought to be placed in vocational programs. SA A ? D SD (31)

10. Basically the culture of the disadvantaged is one of hopelessness and despair. SA A ? D SD (32)

11. The problem of programs for disadvantaged students cannot be solved unless the junior colleges are given sufficient additional funds to deveote to such programs. SA A ? D SD (33)

12. High standards of achievement can be maintained in an "open door" college. SA A ? D SD (34)

13. The very existence of special programs for identified disadvantaged students indicates that the culture and values of such students are less worthy and meaningful than that of the middle-class student. SA A ? D SD (35)

14. There are no significant racial differences in achievement motivation. SA A ? D SD (36)

15. An important function of the educational system is to make achievement independent of background. SA A ? D SD (37)

16. Four-year college standards and requirements frequently prevent the junior colleges from meeting the needs of disadvantaged students. SA A ? D SD (38)

17. It is appropriate for instructors to use middle-class values as guides in formulating goals for and content of special courses for disadvantaged students. SA A ? D SD (39)

18. In-service programs which emphasize the understanding of the attitudes, values, and aspirations of disadvantaged students, should be conducted for instructors engaged in teaching such students. SA A ? D SD (40)

Appendix C (Cont'd.)
Faculty Questionnaire--Section II

19.	The existing entrance requirements for junior colleges should not be changed.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(41)
20.	During the first year in a junior college disadvantaged students ought to be graded on a scale different from that used for regular students in junior colleges.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(42)
21.	Junior college courses can be taught in such a way that immediate and concrete rewards can be seen by disadvantaged students.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(43)
22.	The value of most remedial courses in terms of preparing students for transfer courses is questionable.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(44)
23.	The value of most remedial courses in terms of increasing student achievement is questionable.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(45)
24.	Disadvantaged students in junior colleges find that most courses which they are required to take are of little relevance in terms of their needs, interests, or concerns.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(46)
25.	The value systems of disadvantaged students are not compatible with the requirements of a college education.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(47)
26.	Disadvantaged students whose communication skills are inadequate ought to be referred to some other institution, such as an adult high school, for upgrading or retraining.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(48)
27.	Students should be grouped heterogeneously with regard to ability in most general education courses.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(49)
28.	Disadvantaged students often have problems which prevent them from demonstrating creativity.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(50)
29.	There are large numbers of disadvantaged students in this district who have graduated from high schools but who have not enrolled in junior colleges.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(51)
30.	Special programs for disadvantaged students are just another method of preserving de facto segregation.	SA	A	?	D	SD	(52)

*****

Your major field:
(Please check only one field. If your time is evenly divided, please check the field with which you identify most.)

(53-1) __ Librarian
(54-1) __ Counselor
(55-0) __ Instructor in art, music, or drama
(55-1) __ Instructor in business
(55-2) __ Instructor in English or speech
(55-3) __ Instructor in foreign languages
(55-4) __ Instructor in humanities
(55-5) __ Instructor in natural sciences or mathematics
(55-6) __ Instructor in physical education
(55-7) __ Instructor in semi-professional program
(55-8) __ Instructor in social sciences
(55-9) __ Instructor in trade-technical program
(56-) __ Other (____________________)

(57) Number of years you have been employed in a junior college:

________ 0-3 (1) ________ 4-10 (2) ________ Over 10 (3)

(58) Your age bracket:

________ 21-30 (1) ________ 31-40 (2) ________ 41-50 (3) ________ 51-65 (4)

(59) Sex:

________ Male (1) ________ Female (2)

(60, 61) Name of your college:____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

Appendix D

Final Question Form and Covering Letter

The Peralta Colleges
300 GRAND AVENUE · OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94610 · TELEPHONE (415) 834-5500

John W. Dunn • Superintendent
Clement A. Long • Asst. Superintendent

April 22, 1968

Dear ________________:

At the beginning of this academic year we sent a Preliminary Question Form to each junior college in California in connection with the study of programs for disadvantaged students which we are conducting for the Junior College Advisory Panel of the State Board of Education. On the basis of the responses to this Preliminary Question Form we selected approximately thirty junior colleges for intensive study.

Since we wish to include in our study all significant efforts being made on behalf of socio-economically disadvantaged students, I am asking you now to complete and return to me as soon as possible the enclosed Final Question Form.

It is our intention to make an oral report to a combined meeting of the Junior College Advisory Panel and the State Board of Governors about the middle of June and to distribute copies of the final report soon after the end of June.

Thank you for your assistance in this very important project.

Sincerely,

Ernest H. Berg
Director of Educational Services

EHB:ps
Enclosure

FINAL QUESTION FORM

1. I believe that you should visit this college because we do have a significant program for socio-economically disadvantaged students. ______

2. Since submitting the Preliminary Question Form we have developed a significant program for socio-economically disadvantaged students. ______

3. I am enclosing copies of studies which have been conducted in connection with the problem of socio-economically disadvantaged students. ______

4. We are now planning a program for disadvantaged students. (Enclose information if possible.) ______

5. We do not have a significant number of socio-economically disadvantaged students within this district. ______

COMMENTS:

____
Name

____
Title

____
College